



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 24, 2022

No. 108

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. MCBATH).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

June 24, 2022.

I hereby appoint the Honorable LUCY MCBATH to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, You created the world and called it good—and it was good. As we acknowledge that our heritage is deeply rooted in the first human beings, we ask Your forgiveness. For like them, we have dared to challenge Your supreme authority in favor of our own will.

Like Cain who murdered Abel with his hands because his heart had turned from You, even today our wills are set on our position, our power, and our pride. We weaponize the things at our hands and fail to humble our hearts to accept Your peaceful design for community.

Turn our wills, O God, from evil. Speak into our souls and save us from ourselves. For from the beginning of time we have been the obstacles to peace and justice. From the smallest infraction against a colleague to the vengeance we call down on our enemies, we have been and remain responsible for the roadblocks to reconciliation.

God, grant us Your wisdom to live the righteous life You intended for our

first ancestors. May Your divine insight make our hearts pure, peace-loving, considerate, full of mercy, impartial, and sincere.

Then may our deeds henceforth be borne in the humanity that comes from Your eternal and gracious plan.

In Your merciful name we pray, and by Your grace we live.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(a) of House Resolution 188, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. DEAN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CONGRATULATING RAYMOND JADCZAK

(Ms. DEAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of Raymond Jadcak, owner of PJ Auto Repair in Horsham, Pennsylvania, who is retiring on July 9.

This year marks the 50th anniversary of PJ Auto Repair, a family-owned business led by Ray and his son, Samuel Jadcak.

Born and raised in Jenkintown, Pennsylvania, and graduating from my alma mater, too, Abington High School in 1968, Raymond grew up in a mechanically-inclined household, often working on cars as a teenager with his late father, John.

After high school, he turned his passion into a lifelong career. At just 22, Ray opened an ARCO gas and repair service business. He was one of the youngest ARCO franchises in the Philadelphia region.

In 1982, Ray was recognized by the National Institute for Automotive Service Excellence as Mechanic of the Year.

For five decades, PJ Auto Repair has helped thousands, while creating jobs in our district.

As he prepares to hand off his business to his son, Sam, I rise to congratulate Raymond on a long and distinguished career of serving our community.

RECOGNIZING MASHAMA BAILEY

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mashama Bailey for her achievement of receiving the prestigious James Beard Award for Outstanding Chef.

Mashama is a renowned chef at The Grey in Savannah, Georgia, where she has served Southern cuisine since 2014.

She traveled to many locations around the world, perfecting her culinary craft, and uses what she has learned to showcase the amazing taste of Southern cuisine.

The James Beard Award was established to highlight the exceptional talent and achievements in the culinary

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5881

arts. Mashama also received the James Beard Award for Best Chef: Southeast back in 2019.

Throughout her career, she has taken the fine dining world by storm through her exceptional dishes that have helped put Savannah among some of the best culinary spots in the Nation.

Mashama's commitment to her passion has fed many Savannahians some of the best food in the world, and she is an inspiration to the First Congressional District.

Congratulations, Mashama, and good luck in your future endeavors.

CRACKING DOWN ON UNFAIR SHIPPING FEES

(Ms. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BROWN of Ohio, Madam Speaker, supply chain disruptions caused by the pandemic have contributed to rising prices across America. These disruptions included considerable congestion at our ports last year.

In this void, the Port of Cleveland in my district, increased its tonnage by nearly 70 percent, helping to keep goods moving across America and beyond.

Yet, even as congestion has eased, international shipping companies have been charging extremely high fees to transport goods.

This is driving up costs on store shelves and hurting our small businesses while leaving key products waiting on our docks.

Last week, the House passed, and President Biden signed into law the bipartisan Ocean Shipping Reform Act. The law cracks down on these unfair shipping fees.

This will help goods get in and out of docks like the Port of Cleveland quicker, it will reduce costs for families, and it will level the playing field for our businesses. I call that a win-win.

RECOGNIZING DR. DAVIE JANE GILMOUR

(Mr. KELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KELLER, Madam Speaker, after nearly 25 years of service as President of the Pennsylvania College of Technology, Dr. Davie Jane Gilmour is retiring.

During her accomplished tenure, Dr. Gilmour has guided Penn College through challenges, growth, and innovation, ultimately shaping the institution into a national leader in applied technology education.

Penn College has stepped up in a big way to develop Pennsylvania's workforce and close the skills gap, largely due to Dr. Gilmour's vision and commitment to giving students the tools to excel in high demand fields.

Dr. Gilmour and I share that vision, and I have enjoyed working with Penn

College in Congress to develop policies that bring job creators and the workforce closer together, expand opportunities for career and technical education, promote economic development, and spur job creation.

I thank Dr. Gilmour for her service, vision, and tireless commitment to Penn College's important mission. I wish Dr. Gilmour all the best in her future endeavors.

BUILDING A BETTER AMERICA

(Ms. GARCIA of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Madam Speaker, I rise today to applaud President Biden and House Democrats' efforts to lower the cost of goods for hardworking American families.

As we have seen, war criminal Putin has caused price hikes by way of his cruel war on Ukraine. As a result, Americans are seeing rising costs at the gas pump and the grocery stores and across the shelves of stores.

While extreme MAGA Republicans have chosen to play the blame game, President Biden and House Democrats have decided to take action. Together, we are delivering results.

We have passed key bills like the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act, which will strengthen supply chains and produce cleaner and cheaper gas. This will lead to lower prices.

You see, Democrats are laser focused on lowering costs for hardworking families, not helping greedy billionaires and greedy companies. Together, we will continue building a better America.

PROTECTING INDIVIDUAL FREEDOMS

(Mr. SMITH of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Madam Speaker, as a strong advocate and fighter for the Second Amendment, I cannot support the Senate's gun control bill.

The legislation is simply another attempt to blame law-abiding gun owners instead of holding accountable the disturbed criminals who are carrying out despicable acts of violence.

The gun control bill would strengthen red flag laws, which take away individuals' due process rights, while allowing law enforcement to remove guns from individuals at the request of an expansive list of acquaintances.

In America, a person is innocent until proven guilty. But liberal Democrats, they don't see it quite that way. The presumption of innocence—the foundation of our criminal justice system—apparently does not apply to law-abiding gun owners in the world of the Democrats' vision.

I will fight tooth and nail to protect families from Washington Democrats'

relentless attacks on our freedom and way of life.

McGOVERN-DOLE INTERNATIONAL FOOD FOR EDUCATION AND CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAM

(Mr. McGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McGOVERN, Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the George McGovern-Robert Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program.

Twenty years ago, Congress established McGovern-Dole as a permanent program under USDA in the 2002 farm bill. McGovern-Dole provides at least one nutritious school meal to some of the world's most vulnerable children.

It is a life-changing program that has improved the food security, nutrition, literacy, and education of 31 million children, their families, and communities—building goodwill toward the American people in over 48 countries.

With the support of American farmers, ranchers, and millers, McGovern-Dole programs are carried out by NGOs, the U.N. World Food Programme, local partners with U.S. financial and technical assistance, and U.S. and locally purchased food commodities.

Congressman TRACEY MANN and I have introduced H. Res. 1156 to continue the McGovern-Dole program and build upon its 20 years of success. I invite all of my colleagues to cosponsor and support this resolution.

INFLATION

(Mr. ROSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROSE, Madam Speaker, Federal Reserve Chair Jerome Powell has confirmed what we knew all along: Inflation isn't because of Putin's disgraceful invasion of Ukraine. It is because of President Biden's and congressional Democrats' reckless spending.

Earlier this week, during a Senate Banking Committee hearing, my friend and fellow Tennessean, Senator BILL HAGERTY, pointed out that inflation had already risen to 7 percent well before the war in Ukraine.

He asked Chair Powell if the war in Ukraine is the primary driver of inflation. Chair Powell responded, "No. Inflation was high before, certainly before the war in Ukraine broke out."

This isn't a Putin price hike, it is Bidenflation, and the Biden administration and congressional Democrats and their allies in the mainstream media need to stop with the misdirection and misleading excuses. Thankfully, Tennesseans are smart and can recognize the difference.

Taking responsibility for mistakes followed by straight talk are necessary prerequisites for getting us out of this

mess and are our minimum expectations for the President of the United States. President Biden must do better.

STOPPING HUNGER IN AMERICA

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, our children are hungry, and I rise to support hungry children and to end their hunger.

I rise to support the Keep Kids Fed Act of 2022. One in every seven households with children struggle to get enough food on the table.

Just weeks into our pandemic, which still continues, one in every three households with children, nearly half of all mothers, struggle to feed our children.

It is crucial that we take emergency action to immediately stop the hunger in this Nation, and certainly, we should look around the world, as well.

Congress must extend key flexibilities, and so this legislation provides nationwide waiver authority, allows waivers related to the summer food program.

In my district, all of the school districts have children that are in need of food: breakfast, lunch, and dinner. Stop hungry children from suffering and pass this legislation and end hunger for children as we know it.

The work must continue. Hungry children cannot be what America is defined as, and they must be safe. I ask my colleagues to join me in stopping hunger in America in our children and families.

□ 0915

HONORING THE CAREER OF LAURA MULLIGAN THOMAS

(Mr. GOOD of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Laura Mulligan Thomas.

On May 18, 2022, Laura Mulligan Thomas, alongside her students, presented her final concert as director of the Charlottesville High School orchestra.

After a 40-year career at Charlottesville High School, Ms. Thomas will begin her retirement on June 30, 2022. She began in 1982 with a group of just eight CHS students as part of the CHS orchestra. Now that orchestra includes over 100 students and is internationally recognized.

Ms. Thomas has received a number of awards, including winning the 2022 American String Teachers Association's Elizabeth A. H. Green School Educator Award. Beyond the accolades she has received, I specifically want to thank her for her commitment to supporting the students of Charlottesville High School.

Perhaps the greatest testament to Ms. Thomas' work is knowing that

many of her students have gone on to become music teachers just like her.

I thank Laura Mulligan Thomas for her dedication to Charlottesville High School and her community. I wish her the best in her retirement.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 23, 2022.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 23, 2022, at 11:30 p.m.

That the Senate passed S. 4261.

That the Senate agrees to the House of Representatives amendment with further amendments S. 2938.

That the Senate agrees to the House of Representatives amendments with a further amendment S. 2089.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KEVIN F. MCCUMBER,
Deputy Clerk.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO S. 2938, JOSEPH WOODROW HATCHETT UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE AND FEDERAL BUILDING; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO S. 2089, KEEP KIDS FED ACT OF 2022; RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4346, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2022; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 117-385) on the resolution (H. Res. 1204) providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the House amendment to the bill (S. 2938) to designate the United States Courthouse and Federal Building located at 111 North Adams Street in Tallahassee, Florida, as the "Joseph Woodrow Hatchett United States Courthouse and Federal Building", and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the bill (S. 2089) to amend the Families First Coronavirus Response Act to extend child nutrition waiver authority, and for other purposes; relating to consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 4346) making appropriations for Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO S. 2938, JOSEPH WOODROW HATCHETT UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE AND FEDERAL BUILDING; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO S. 2089, KEEP KIDS FED ACT OF 2022; RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4346, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2022; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1204 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1204

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2938) to designate the United States Courthouse and Federal Building located at 111 North Adams Street in Tallahassee, Florida, as the "Joseph Woodrow Hatchett United States Courthouse and Federal Building", and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments to the House amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendments to the House amendment. The Senate amendments and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2089) to amend the Families First Coronavirus Response Act to extend child nutrition waiver authority, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment to the House amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Education and Labor or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor or their respective designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall be considered to have taken from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4346) making appropriations for Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to have concurred in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-53.

SEC. 4. House Resolution 1132 is hereby adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the

customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, earlier today, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1204, for two measures.

First, it provides for consideration of the Senate amendments to the House amendment to S. 2938, the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act. The rule makes in order a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary that the House concur in the Senate amendments. It provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Second, the rule provides for consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to S. 2089, the Keep Kids Fed Act of 2022. The rule makes in order a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Education and Labor that the House concur in the Senate amendment and provides 10 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Finally, the rule deems passage of H. Res. 1132 and deems that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 4346 with an amendment.

Madam Speaker, let me first say that I am so disappointed with where this school meals extension landed. We had a bipartisan, bicameral agreement in place, a measure that, in my opinion, didn't go far enough. But I was willing to support it because we have a hunger cliff looming in 6 days.

It passed the House yesterday by a vote of 376-42. Then, one Senator decided to hold up the bill, a bill to give kids free meals over the summer and provide administrative flexibilities and extra funding to schools in the fall. The objection? A provision that gave free meals at school for kids at 185 percent of poverty or below. For a family of four, that is a family with a maximum total household income of just over \$50,000 a year.

What a rotten thing to do. I can't say the words I would like to use on the House floor to describe just how callous this is, so let me just say this: It takes a real jerk to take food out of the mouths of kids.

I am going to support this bill. The stakes are too high for us not to support it, and there are a lot of good provisions in here, provisions that extend

the flexibilities and provide a reimbursement rate increase to schools to help them continue serving kids nutritious meals and extend universal free meals over the summer.

But I am going to continue fighting like hell at every chance to make sure that every child gets a free breakfast and lunch as part of their school day.

Food is a right. I believe it is a fundamental human right. And for kids living in poverty, school meals are sometimes the only nutritious food that they have access to.

I thank my friends, Chairman SCOTT and Chairwoman STABENOW, for their work in averting the hunger cliff and getting free meals to kids this summer. I thank Speaker PELOSI for her incredible leadership. I thank Chairwoman ROSA DELAURO for her persistence on this.

They are all dedicated to ending hunger, especially among children. I am going to continue to work with them until we finally end hunger in this country once and for all.

In addition, Madam Speaker, let me just say that this is a historic moment. We are on the threshold of passing the first major overhaul of Federal gun safety legislation in decades. This bill that we will soon vote on will save lives, and it couldn't come at a more important time.

As the American people are demanding that we do more to prevent gun violence, the Supreme Court is recklessly striking down gun safety laws that have been on the books for over a century.

As the American people look to Congress to take action to prevent the next mass shooting, House Republican leaders are caving to the gun lobby, whipping against a bipartisan, bicameral agreement of commonsense gun safety measures that an overwhelming majority of the American people support.

Despite what you will hear on the floor today, the American people get it. They know the terrible toll gun violence has taken on communities all across this country: over 100 per day killed by guns; more children killed with a gun in the last two decades than on-duty police officers and Active-Duty military combined; the list of mass shootings and tragedies grows longer and longer by the month.

Yet, if you talk to Republicans here in the House, you would think we are living in an alternative universe. Just this week, most Republicans voted down a bill to alert people when a mass shooting was happening near them. Let me repeat that: Just this week, Republicans voted down a bill to alert people when a mass shooting was happening near them.

Are you kidding me? What kind of people don't even want you to know which way to run if there is a shooting nearby?

I am so sick and tired of the stranglehold that the gun lobby and their blood money have on the Republican Party.

Enough is enough. The time has come for action. The time has come for us to put aside politics and actually do the right thing.

I commend the many Republicans who have done just that. I don't think I could agree with Senator MITCH MCCONNELL on where to go to have lunch, but he said that the Safer Communities Act is "a commonsense package of popular steps that will help make these horrifying incidents less likely while fully upholding the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens." That is MITCH MCCONNELL.

Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM—and we are polar opposites—said: "The legislation is not perfect, but we must not let the perfect become the enemy of the good." That is LINDSEY GRAHAM.

Even here in the House, some courageous Republicans have said that they will support this bill, like Congressman TONY GONZALES, who said: "It is my duty to pass laws that never infringe on the Constitution while protecting the lives of the innocent."

The U.S. Senate is notorious for not being able to build consensus around solutions to fix the most straightforward of problems, yet here they have come up with a reasonable, bipartisan deal on a contentious issue.

I think it is shameful, quite frankly, that GOP Leader MCCARTHY and his team are parroting the gun lobby's talking points. But what I find even more disappointing, frankly, are the crocodile tears about bipartisanship from the GOP when they vote time and time again against substantial bipartisan deals like this one.

Please spare us the lectures. Nothing in this bill is new. Nothing in this bill is controversial. These ideas have been around for decades, and they are what the American people want.

If people are worried about backlash back home, this is an opportunity for you to correct the record. Go home and tell the truth that this bill does nothing to infringe on the Second Amendment, and it doesn't punish law-abiding gun owners.

□ 0930

This country is crying out for action. Americans are begging us to work together to protect our kids and our communities.

I know I am asking you to vote against your party's leadership. I know that is a tough spot to put some of my Republican friends in. But I think at the end of the day, you owe it to yourself to consider this one idea: What if this bill stops even one mass shooting from happening? Is a "no" vote worth the lives of your constituents?

Don't listen to those who are spreading crazy conspiracy theories, saying that this is going to lead to everyone's guns getting taken away. We hear it over and over and over again. Listen to your GOP colleagues who helped write this bill and who passed it over in the Senate. Listen to the American people who overwhelmingly support this bill, and then listen to your conscience.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the Representative from Massachusetts and the distinguished chair of the Rules Committee for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker, S. 2938, as amended in the Senate, is at its core an effort to chip away at the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens. It has received no hearings, no committee process, and has only recently been released in bill form for the public to review. It came to us very early this morning after the Senate passed it late last night, and my colleagues expect us to vote on this bill later today, despite the egregious procedural violations. Unfortunately for the American people, that is not a unique development here in Congress. I am disappointed that this is the way the majority has chosen to proceed with legislation, with no hearing and no public input.

The bill provides \$750 million over 5 years in Federal Byrne JAG grant funding to States for crisis intervention proceedings, including State-level red flag programs. However, this bill fails to provide explicit due process requirements. We have seen in places where red flag laws have been adopted that these types of laws always infringe on the constitutional rights of law-abiding gun owners. This ambiguous language contains insufficient guardrails to ensure that the money is actually going toward keeping guns out of the hands of criminals or preventing mass violence.

Vague red flag laws are ripe for abuse and can become extremely dangerous. For example, a person could have just gotten out of an abusive relationship and has a firearm to defend themselves against their ex-partner. Their abusive partner could report this individual and have their firearm taken away, putting the victim at even greater risk.

This bill also includes provisions that will lead to enhanced scrutiny of certain adults based on their age before they can exercise their constitutionally guaranteed rights. There are no other constitutional rights in which we require enhanced screenings of certain adults based solely on their age.

There is also surprisingly little in this bill that actually focuses on making our schools safer. The bill does nothing to help provide for additional school resource officers. I suspect this is due to the fact that some of my Democrat colleagues are still incapable of supporting funding for additional law enforcement officers, even in our children's schools.

Lastly, we know that this is just the tip of the iceberg. President Biden and my Democrat colleagues have made it abundantly clear that this is just a "small step" toward their larger gun-grabbing agenda. The actions of this administration's Department of Justice, FBI, and ATF have completely

whittled away the confidence of gun-owning Americans that the provisions in these bills will not be abused beyond their stated scope.

House Republicans are committed to identifying and solving the root causes of violent crimes and bolstering school security, but doing so must not infringe upon the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens. For example, just earlier this week, we voted on the bipartisan Restoring Hope for Mental Health and Well-Being Act. This bill contains the bulk of the mental health care provisions included in the Senate bill, without infringing on Second Amendment rights.

In this case, the bill we are considering under this rule is not only a blatant infringement on lawful gun owners' Second Amendment rights, but an unnecessary duplication of the bipartisan work we have already done.

Madam Speaker, for these reasons, I oppose the rule, ask Members to do the same, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, let me just say that it is a little frustrating to kind of hear my colleagues imply that somehow we are moving too fast, after decades of inaction, of doing absolutely nothing, after massacre after massacre after massacre, doing nothing. Now we are being accused of moving too fast.

Want to talk about the process? We have had countless hearings on gun violence and on measures to combat gun violence in a variety of committees here. We had a committee hold a hearing with a young girl from Uvalde who told Members of Congress that she had to cover herself with the blood of her dead classmate and pretend that she was dead in order to escape being killed herself.

We have heard from law enforcement officials. We have heard from grieving parents. Nothing in this bill is controversial. People have seen—the text of this bill has been available since Tuesday. It is not that complicated.

So when people say: Process, oh, we just need more time, and we should do more hearings, and we should do this and we should do that—no. I mean, this is put up or shut up time for all of us. This is an opportunity that we cannot miss.

So the choice for Members on both sides is simple. I mean, we are either going to do something—again, this is way more modest than anything that I would suggest that we do. But we are either going to do something, or we are going to do the same old same old, nothing.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, the American people know that we cannot sit idly by and watch preventable gun deaths happen day after day, year after year.

Over the past few weeks, I have heard from hundreds of constituents of all ages and all walks of life who are demanding action to reduce gun violence.

When our Framers gathered in Philadelphia to write the Constitution, they were explicit about the purposes of that entire document: . . . establish justice, to insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense—not individual Armageddon—"promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

With those words, our Government was created to meet the needs of the people.

But how can we meet the needs of the people if we don't take action to prevent them from being gunned down in their schools, workplaces, houses of worship, or neighborhood streets?

How can we be faithful to the purposes of the Constitution while allowing the routine terrorization and slaughter of our children, neighbors, teachers, doctors, and seniors?

I refuse to tell the American people, and particularly our children, that they must be sacrificial lambs to a twisted theory of armed Second Amendment liberty that defies the express purposes of our Constitution by undermining the general welfare and destroying domestic tranquility.

The American people know, as well as we do, that the time is now to act. The Safer Communities Act is a minimal first step in taking action to keep our children and communities safe. But after 30 years of Senate inaction, it is a step, and we know that it should not be the last.

Our children deserve a brighter future in which they can enjoy the blessings of liberty, instead of being traumatized by active-shooter drills and actual active shooters.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to mention that my distinguished colleague repeatedly talks about how this is not controversial. If it is not controversial, then committee hearings held by the majority should not be a problem. So I would ask again that we follow the procedures of the House.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately consider Congressman HUDSON's STOP II Act, critical legislation that addresses two issues that both sides of the aisle should be able to agree on, hardening for schools and active-shooter training, law enforcement, and mental health funding.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, House Republicans are committed to addressing the tragedy of these school shootings, but we cannot and should not impede the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens. This is not a matter of Democrat or Republican; it is a matter of what is in the Constitution.

Congressman HUDSON's legislation is something we can pass right now, today, that will have immediate positive effects, keeping students safe while getting Americans the mental health resources they need.

Many of these solutions are included in the bill we are considering under the rule, but Congressman HUDSON's solution achieves the same outcome without infringing on our Second Amendment rights.

Madam Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON), to speak further on the amendment.

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so that we can immediately consider my bill, H.R. 7966, the STOP II, Secure Every School and Protect our Nation's Children Act.

It is an honor to be here today. In fact, what an honor that the people of North Carolina's Eighth Congressional District have bestowed upon me to allow me to be their Representative here in the United States Congress.

As I walked the Halls of this Capitol building this morning, I couldn't help but think of the great American patriots who have served here before us.

I think about the patriots who came before, who pledged their lives, their property, and their sacred honor so that we could live in the freedom and prosperity we enjoy today. People like Patrick Henry, who famously said: "Give me liberty or give me death."

The courage of our Founders, the faith, the strength of their convictions, the belief in an ideal—indeed, an idea—that all people are endowed by our creator with certain unalienable rights. And they devised a Constitution that protects and guarantees these rights. It is an incredible thing to think about, the legacy they have left in the hands of this, the 117th Congress. Each one of us swore an oath when we accepted this office. It wasn't an oath to a person or a political party. It was an oath to defend the Constitution.

The issue before us today is what can we do—no, what should we do when faced with the challenge before us, this epidemic of children taking the lives of other children in our schools?

Every single one of us grieves for the lives taken. As the father of an elementary school child, my heart aches for the lives lost and the unimaginable pain and grief felt by those who love them. Neither party cares more about this. Neither political party has a monopoly on wanting to do something.

That is why Republicans have come to the table with ideas that will actually get to some of the root causes of this violence. More than 12 pieces of

legislation have been introduced by Republican Members of this House to strengthen background checks, to improve law enforcement coordination and response, to address the mental health needs of our children, to make schools safer, and to prevent this violence.

To date, my colleagues across the aisle have been unwilling to engage with us, to seek consensus, to work together to solve this problem.

Just a few weeks ago, the majority party brought forth a package of gun control measures. This legislation targeted the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens. This legislation did nothing to address the security in our schools. It did nothing to provide better mental health resources to improve the ability of school officials and law enforcement to intervene with these children in crisis. But it did let a lot of people around here feel better, because they could go home and say: We did something.

Over in the Senate, they aren't even considering this reckless package of bills. But Republicans and Democrats in the Senate did attempt to work together to find a solution, and there are many things that I like about this Senate legislation. In fact, I am flattered that they use much of the mental health and school safety provisions from my legislation. But as much as we feel the need to do something to tackle this problem, we cannot forget that oath that we all took on the first day of this Congress.

□ 0945

Our highest calling as a Member of Congress is to defend the Constitution. And that is where this legislation sent to us by the Senate falls short. This open-ended gun control legislation opens the door to Federal funding of State red flag laws. First of all, these laws don't work.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a list of 12 mass shootings that have taken place in States that already have red flag laws.

"RED FLAG" FAILURES

May 14, 2022, Buffalo, N.Y.
Payton S. Gedron, 10 fatalities
New York's "Red Flag" law went into effect August 24, 2019
May 26, 2021, San Jose, Calif.
Samuel Cassidy, 9 fatalities
California's "Red Flag" law was enacted in 2016
April 15, 2021, Indianapolis, Ind.
Brandon Scott Hole, 8 fatalities
Indiana's "Red Flag" law went into effect in 2005
March 31, 2021, Orange, Calif.
Aminadab Gaxiola Gonzalez, 4 fatalities
California's "Red Flag" law was enacted in 2016
March 22, 2021, Boulder, Colo.
Ahmad Al Aliwi Alissa, 10 fatalities
Colorado's "Red Flag" law went into effect January 2020
December 10, 2019, Jersey City, N.J.
David N. Anderson and Francine Graham, 4 fatalities
New Jersey's "Red Flag" law went into effect September 1, 2019
July 28, 2019, Gilroy, Calif.

Santino William LeGan, 3 fatalities, 12 injured

California's "Red Flag" law was enacted in 2016

February 15, 2019, Aurora, Ill.
Gary Martin, 5 fatalities
Illinois's "Red Flag" law went into effect January 1, 2019

January 23, 2019, Sebring, Fla.
Zephen A. Xaver, 5 fatalities
Florida's "Red Flag" law took effect March 2018

November 7, 2018, Thousand Oaks, Calif.
Ian David Long, 12 fatalities
California's "Red Flag" law was enacted in 2016

September 12, 2018, Bakersfield, Calif.
Javier Casarez, 5 fatalities
California's "Red Flag" law was enacted in 2016

November 14, 2017, Rancho Tehama, Calif.
Kevin Janson Neal, 5 fatalities
California's "Red Flag" law was enacted in 2016

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, the State with the most mass shootings is California. California has the most restrictive gun laws in America. California already has a red flag law. But more important to this debate, red flag laws subvert due process protections and threaten the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens.

Why would we agree to borrow more money that we don't have so the Federal Government can give it to States to enact laws that don't work and that actually threaten the rights of our citizens?

Why would we do that?

Second, this legislation singles out law-abiding citizens under the age of 21 by giving the government discretion to delay, for any reason, their constitutionally protected right to a firearm—a right, by the way, affirmed, yet again, by the Supreme Court just yesterday.

We all want to keep firearms out of the hands of people that shouldn't have them, and I am willing to consider ways to better identify people with mental health challenges, but I can't help but think about that 20-year-old paratrooper stationed in Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

Our Nation entrusted him to defend us with an automatic weapon or a multimillion-dollar-weapon system, but we can't trust him with a semiautomatic weapon to defend themselves in their own home?

What about the 20-year-old spouse back home in Spring Lake, North Carolina, alone because our paratrooper has deployed in service of our Nation. Are we to tell this spouse that the government doesn't trust you to defend your home?

Instead, we are going to delay your purchase for 10 days. At the end of the 10 days, the government doesn't even have to get back to the gun owner or the gun store. Let that gun dealer decide if they want to take a risk on selling you this firearm while an FBI investigation is still open.

No, this is a de facto ban on gun sales to law-abiding citizens under the age of 21.

Third, this legislation also broadens firearm prohibitions for misdemeanors and nonviolent offenders. I think most of us can agree, someone convicted of beating up their spouse ought to be put on the background check system. The law extends this to misdemeanor assault on a spouse or someone with whom you share a child. But we have to be careful when we are talking about taking away a constitutionally protected right over other misdemeanors.

The language of this bill is so broad it can include nonviolent offenders, and I am concerned that the due process protections are simply not there.

So what are we proposing today? Let's set aside these controversial unconstitutional provisions that divide us. Let's unite around the idea that we are going to tackle the real causes of this violence. These school shootings are almost always done by a young male, often from a single-parent or no-parent home. They have experienced some trauma in their life. Most are likely on some behavioral medication, and they have shown plenty of signs of being in crisis. Yet, effective intervention and mental health treatment did not happen.

So let's start there. Today, I rise to propose we defeat this previous question and replace the Senate language with H.R. 7966.

This legislation builds on the STOP School Violence Act signed into law in 2018 by providing a billion dollars in grants to hire more school resource officers. It provides \$1 billion to hire mental health guidance counselors so that schools have the resources to intervene with these children in crisis.

Imagine, if we had been able to intervene with the shooter in Uvalde before he dropped out of high school.

This legislation includes \$5 billion to fund STOP School Violence programs to make schools safer, to provide active shooter training to law enforcement, and to better equip school officials and students and law enforcement to intervene before one of these students reaches the breaking point. This \$7 billion is paid for by redirecting unspent COVID-19 funds that have already been approved.

Also, under my legislation, schools can apply for a threat assessment to identify weaknesses in their security and to assess the mental health services at the school. We would also codify a clearinghouse at Homeland Security to collect and share best practices for school safety. These are practical, commonsense solutions that we should all be able to agree will have a real impact.

Madam Speaker, I agree with my friend. Now is our moment. Today, we can come together—Republicans and Democrats—and really address these issues in a meaningful way. We can do this while at the same time keeping the promise made by the sacrifice and the courage of our Founders by upholding our pledge on the first day in office to defend this Constitution.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question so we can immediately consider this important legislation. God bless you.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just say a couple of words in response to the gentleman from North Carolina.

He just said that Democrats and Republicans should come together. Well, they did. I mean, MITCH MCCONNELL is a Republican. LINDSEY GRAHAM is Republican. TONY GONZALEZ is a Republican. I mean, Republicans and Democrats have come together like they never have before on this issue. Maybe my Republican friends ought to get together with their Republican friends to try to work it out on their side. But Democrats and Republicans have come together.

I am having trouble following the gentleman's logic when he basically implies that if we can't do something to stop all shootings, then maybe it is not worth doing anything. Nobody is saying that what we are doing today will prevent every shooting. What we are saying today is that it will prevent some. What we are saying today is it will protect lives.

In the aftermath of Uvalde and Buffalo, people all across this country, regardless of their politics, were so horrified. They are demanding that we act. Again, as I said at the outset, I would have preferred that we do more. I understand that we can only get done what we can get done in the reality in which we are living here in the Congress; and in the Senate you need 10 Republicans to get permission to have a cup of coffee. The fact of the matter is, there is a process over there that has prevented even a debate on gun safety legislation because of the filibuster. But a number of Republican Senators came together because they listened to their constituents, and I think they finally said we have to do something.

No one is saying this will stop every shooting, but under that logic, why do we have fire departments?

We have fire departments but there are still fires.

Why do we have seatbelt laws?

There are seatbelt laws and there are still people that get killed in car crash fatalities.

I mean, the bottom line is, we have them because they save some lives, and it is worth it. As I said at the outset, for every item in this bipartisan package there has been a hearing on at some point. None of these ideas are new. So there has been a process.

But what I find particularly ironic is that as we are being lectured about, oh, we need more time, we need more hearings, the gentlewoman says that we should bring up the gentleman's bill and consider it immediately with no hearings, with no process. I mean, I get whiplash just trying to follow the logic of my friends from the other side.

Madam Speaker, the bottom line is either we are going to do something, or we are not. And those who are arguing for delaying this more and more and more are the same people who will never vote for it.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, let me thank the chairman very much for yielding, and for the expeditious way in which the Committee on Rules realized that we are in crisis.

Let me just start by saying to stop the carnage and the bloodshed, I rise in support of the bipartisan Safer Communities Act. And since I know that this Congress has vision and it has passion to move, as well, the Protect Our Kids Act as we go forward in the future.

I realize that this bipartisan effort is historic, particularly in light of the Supreme Court decision which took history and literally shredded the constitutional privileges of life and liberty by suggesting that laws that under Heller were legal, could not be in place. Legislation that is going to come before us will, in fact, emphasize that we want to save lives.

Madam Speaker, I support this effort going forward because I want to say to the grieving families of Buffalo, the grieving families of Mother Emanuel, the grieving families in Uvalde, the parent who spoke to me just two nights ago whose daughter bled out, that we are listening.

I also rise today to support H. Res. 1132, which says to the world that the United States Congress calls on the Government of Russia, the Russian Federation, to immediately release Brittney Griner.

This bill was introduced by myself, Congressman STANTON and Congressman ALLRED, because we realize this young woman who grew up and was born in Houston, Texas, who, was a two-time Olympian, who is a renowned WNBA player, is now wrongfully detained in Russia. She has had a prolific collegiate career and went to Nimitz High School and Baylor University.

She is someone who has been known to be generous in her community by providing an outstanding program that helps young people. She has the Heart and Soul Shoe Drive. She is an American's American.

We ask that you support this H. Res. 1132 to release Brittney Griner now.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule which brings to the floor S. 2938, the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, and H. Res. 1132, "Calling for the immediate release of Brittney Griner".

Both the bill and the resolution addressed by this rule advance bedrock American values and priorities that are intrinsic to our national character.

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act provides reasonable, common-sense measures to enhance safety and reduce gun violence that is increasingly inflicting unspeakable pain and suffering on American families.

I have never met an American who does not want to keep their children safe, and especially protect them from gun violence. The bipartisan nature of the bill emphasizes the universal desire to protect our children and families.

When modest, reasonable measures can be taken to protect lives and avert tragedy, it is our responsibility to embrace that opportunity.

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act will surely save lives. Even if it prevents just one mass shooting—or even if it only saves one life—its worth will be proven.

Consider what America would think if, without enactment of this bill, children were murdered in a mass shooting, and it were determined that the killer would have been prevented from their heinous acts if only this bill had become law. For those families in mourning, Congress's failure to act would be unforgivable.

Instead, by advancing this legislation, we will be averting the most painful tragedy that a family could experience, and many families will be spared that devastation.

The bill's reasonable steps will have a positive impact on public safety and family security for years to come.

H. Res. 1132, which is also addressed by this rule, calls for the release of Brittney Griner and, in so doing, puts Congress on record emphatically defending true American values such as our devotion to human rights, respect and dignity for each person, the right to due process, and justice based on truth.

Each of these have been offended by Russia unjustifiably holding Griner, and by the Russian distortion of a judicial system that extends her detention, preventing her release to return home, without a factual or legal basis for doing so.

Brittney Griner, who grew up in Houston, Texas, is an extension of all of us. She represents quintessential American stories and qualities. The injustices inflicted upon her by Putin and his acolytes in Russia could have been imposed on any Americans within their reach.

The denial of basic rights from Brittney offends all Americans because they are rights to which we believe all people are entitled. We do not accept the dehumanization that is commonplace in Russia, and our values compel us to seek justice for Brittney, her immediate release, and her return home to her family and friends.

As a mother who has raised a family, I can only imagine the gut-wrenching pain that her parents, family, and friends must be feeling right now. There is no worse feeling than when someone in your family is in imminent danger and they are beyond your reach to help them.

As a Black woman, I can say there's no greater fear than having a loved one being wrongfully placed in a situation or environment over which there is no control.

For any of us, if we had a loved one placed in this situation, we would be doing everything in our power to ensure their prompt and safe return.

We would be calling and seeking the help of everyone possible—including the media, the U.S. State Department, and even allies in Russia.

We would press every politician and public figure to fight against the corrupt government of Russia to ensure that our family member is

guaranteed their natural born rights to due process, a fair trial, and a prompt release from detention.

No American citizen should be detained in a foreign country for months, denied access to American consular officials, and dependent upon the performance of a Russian lawyer, especially in absence of substantial evidence of a crime.

Ms. Griner is suffering from Russia's heinous demonstration of power and control that stems from centuries of bigotry and hatred embodied in an autocratic leader who is the very antithesis of everything Ms. Griner represents.

Ms. Griner's detention is primarily based on the country of her citizenship, in a game of political leverage. Since she was targeted because of being an American, every American should take this personally. Her detention is an offense against our country, and against our people.

Griner was detained on February 17, 2022, her initial release date was set to be May 19th, it was then shifted to June 19th, and when that date approached, it was delayed to July 2nd.

That is not justice—it's oppression. We call on Putin and the Russian government to comply with their international treaty obligations.

By passing the rule bringing H. Res. 1132 before us, Congress insists, alongside the Griner family, that Brittney Griner must be immediately and safely released and returned home to the U.S. We are unified in demanding respectful treatment and justice for her, in accordance with American values.

I also rise in support of the rule by which the House has passed H. Res. 1132, "Calling for the immediate release of Brittney Griner".

A very important component of the rule currently before the House is that it: "Provides that House Resolution 1132 is hereby adopted."

I fought hard for passage of H. Res. 1132, introduced by Congressman STANTON, myself, and Congressman ALLRED, because, by raising our voices for Brittney Griner, we raise our voices for bedrock American values and priorities that are intrinsic to our national character.

H. Res. 1132 calls for the release of Brittney Griner and, in so doing, puts Congress on record emphatically defending true American values such as our devotion to human rights, respect and dignity for each person, the right to due process, and justice based on truth.

Each of these have been offended by Russia unjustifiably holding Griner, and by the Russian distortion of a judicial system that extends her detention, preventing her release to return home, without a factual or legal basis for doing so.

Brittney Griner, who grew up in Houston, Texas, is an extension of all of us. She represents quintessential American stories and qualities. The injustices inflicted upon her by Putin and his acolytes in Russia could have been imposed on any Americans within their reach.

The denial of basic rights from Brittney offends all Americans because they are rights to which we believe all people are entitled. We do not accept the dehumanization that is commonplace in Russia, and our values compel us to seek justice for Brittney, her immediate release, and her return home to her family and friends.

As a mother who has raised a family, I can only imagine the gut-wrenching pain that her

parents, family, and friends must be feeling right now. There is no worse feeling than when someone in your family is in imminent danger and they are beyond your reach to help them.

As a Black woman, I can say there's no greater fear than having a loved one being wrongfully placed in a situation or environment over which there is no control.

For any of us, if we had a loved one placed in this situation, we would be doing everything in our power to ensure their prompt and safe return.

We would be calling and seeking the help of everyone possible—including the media, the U.S. State Department, and even allies in Russia.

We would press every politician and public figure to fight against the corrupt government of Russia to ensure that our family member is guaranteed their natural born rights to due process, a fair trial, and a prompt release from detention.

No American citizen should be detained in a foreign country for months, denied access to American consular officials, and dependent upon the performance of a Russian lawyer, especially in absence of substantial evidence of a crime.

Ms. Griner is suffering from Russia's heinous demonstration of power and control that stems from centuries of bigotry and hatred embodied in an autocratic leader who is the very antithesis of everything Ms. Griner represents.

Ms. Griner's detention is primarily based on the country of her citizenship, in a game of political leverage. Since she was targeted because of being an American, every American should take this personally. Her detention is an offense against our country, and against our people.

Griner was detained on February 17, 2022, her initial release date was set to be May 19th, it was then shifted to June 19th, and when that date approached, it was delayed to July 2nd.

That is not justice—it's oppression. We call on Putin and the Russian government to comply with their international treaty obligations.

By passing the rule and adopting H. Res. 1132, the House insists, alongside the Griner family, that Brittney Griner must be immediately and safely released and returned home to the U.S.

We are unified in demanding respectful treatment and justice for her, in accordance with American values.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I wanted to point out to the gentleman from the Massachusetts that the majority solely holds the power to give the bill a hearing. And I am sure I can speak on behalf of the gentleman from North Carolina that he would be happy to be granted a hearing on his bill and would love to have that done given that you are in control of those hearings.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, it is a privilege to be here. This is a somber time. Yes, the Senate has sent us something over

again that we never got to really look into before we have to vote in the House.

Madam Speaker, I actually have a bill, H.R. 7909, that I think you all would be interested if I had gotten to speak to it in the Committee on Rules this morning.

It does three things: It says to our law enforcement retired professionals if they want to get a part-time job as an armed resource officer with the school district, they don't have to pay Social Security, withholding taxes, FICA—none of that—that is so they don't get thrown into a higher income tax bracket.

The second thing it does, is it allows schools to hire an absolute professional, a retired law enforcement professional at a reduced rate, because they don't have to match Social Security, withholding, and FICA.

But third and most importantly what it does, is it gives the students and the teachers and the staff of that facility, first-class armed protection in that school system and in that school district so that when and if this happens, they have got a professional there.

May 18, 2018. It was a Friday; 10 people were killed in Santa Fe High School, in my district.

John Barns, a police officer, an unarmed police officer was there within 3 minutes.

He came around to confront the gunman, and the gunman pretty much eviscerated his right arm with a shotgun. Other police officers showed up quickly.

Madam Speaker, we can do this with help to the school districts. We can get armed professional police officers there to help protect our schools, the kids, teachers, and the staff. It doesn't have to be about violating the Second Amendment. It doesn't have to be about taking away gun rights. This is one simple thing.

Madam Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to look at that bill, see if they are interested in it because it is one way we can help.

□ 1000

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I just want to take a moment to recognize and thank a longtime Rules staffer who will be leaving us next week for the Department of Commerce as their director of legislative affairs.

Rose Laughlin, who is next to me, has been with the Rules Committee for 8 years, starting as an intern with the late Congresswoman, Chair Louise Slaughter. Rose was Ms. Slaughter's right-hand woman.

Rose, I know that Louise was terribly proud of all of your accomplishments and your dedication to the people of this country.

Madam Speaker, I think it is fitting today that Rose is here because this will be her last rule on the House floor. It is fitting that she is here because this is a historic bipartisan measure on gun reform that will actually make it

to the President's desk. No one on this committee has worked harder or more thoughtfully over the years for gun reform than Rose.

Her dependable, resourceful, collaborative attitude has made this work easier for us all. This institution, and those we serve, are better off because of her dedication to public service.

Rose, you always will have a home here at the Capitol. We are going to miss you, but we are excited about continuing to work with you in your new role, and we are very proud of you.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, we join the chairman in wishing Rose the best in her future endeavors. Thank you for that.

Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, House Republicans want to ensure that our schools and communities are safe, but today the lack of hearings, the lack of public input, and the lack of procedure offends our duty to our constituents and our oath to defend the Constitution.

We are not willing to subvert constitutional rights of law-abiding Americans, like this bill would do. There are solutions to prevent tragedies like we have seen without affecting law-abiding gun owners. We can pass those today, and that, both sides can agree on.

Unfortunately, the legislation provided under the rule attaches these solutions to unconstitutional and misguided policies that are a "small step" in the Democrats' broader gun control agenda.

Madam Speaker, I oppose the rule, and I ask Members to do the same. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to vote for this bipartisan bill. It is not that long, and people have had it since Tuesday. It has been posted since Tuesday.

As I said, it is not everything that I think needs to be done. Certainly, it is not everything that we have passed in this House, but it is a start. If we pass this and send it to the President for his signature, and it becomes law, it will save lives. It is what the American people want.

Madam Speaker, I have talked to so many families who have lost loved ones to gun violence. I have watched the hearings in which grieving parents and brothers and sisters have talked about how horrific it was to lose a loved one to gun violence, begging us to do something so that no other family has to go through that.

For years, all of those pleas have fallen on deaf ears. When we have even tried to get anything done here, modest legislation, we send it over to the Senate and couldn't get the 60 votes to even have a discussion on the Senate floor. That just changed.

It changed, I think, because people are so horrified about what just recently happened, but also what has been happening time and time again in this country.

I know the question for everybody here is not about: Does this violate the Second Amendment, or is this taking away guns from lawful gun owners? It is not. That is all garbage. It really is. That is not what this is about.

I get it. The gun lobby is making phone calls and threatening to hold back checks if people somehow don't frustrate this bill so that it can't get to the President's desk.

We were elected to help people and to protect people. In the Senate, we have this remarkable bipartisan collaboration, and in the House, we have Republicans who have supported sensible gun safety legislation.

Madam Speaker, I hope this is an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote in the House. I know that it may not be because the leadership here has urged Republican Members to oppose this. I regret that very much.

When people say that this is somehow a leftwing bill—I mean, MITCH MCCONNELL, LINDSEY GRAHAM? Give me a break. This is a truly bipartisan bill. It is a compromise.

To suggest that we need more hearings on a bill on a compromise that every single topic in this compromise has had hearings on before, to suggest to do that by people who don't want this to move to begin with, come on.

This is the put-up-or-shut-up moment for people here. We either do something, or we are going to do nothing. We have been doing nothing for years.

I urged in my opening that people think long and hard before they vote. Consult your conscience.

I can't go back and talk to parents who lost loved ones to violence and say: "Oh, we tried, but it wasn't perfect." I could easily go back and say: "I wish it were bigger and more. It is not perfect, so I am not going to support it." I am supporting this because it is something, and it is going to save lives.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to please support this. I urge a "yes" on the rule and a "yes" on the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. FISCHBACH is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1204

Strike the first section after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 7966) to provide for increased authorization of funding to secure schools, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on

the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommend. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 7966.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 204, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 297]

YEAS—218

Adams	Doyle, Michael	Malinowski
Aguilar	F.	Maloney
Allred	Escobar	Carolyn B.
Auchincloss	Eshoo	Maloney, Sean
Axne	Espallat	Manning
Barragán	Evans	Matsui
Bass	Fletcher	McBath
Beatty	Foster	McCollum
Bera	Frankel, Lois	McEachin
Beyer	Gallego	McGovern
Bishop (GA)	Garamendi	McNerney
Blumenauer	Garcia (IL)	Meeks
Blunt Rochester	Garcia (TX)	Meng
Bonamici	Golden	Mfume
Bourdeaux	Gomez	Moore (WI)
Bowman	Gonzalez,	Morelle
Boyle, Brendan	Vicente	Moulton
F.	Gottheimer	Mrvan
Brown (MD)	Green, Al (TX)	Murphy (FL)
Brown (OH)	Grijalva	Nadler
Brownley	Harder (CA)	Napolitano
Bush	Hayes	Neal
Bustos	Higgins (NY)	Neguse
Butterfield	Himes	Newman
Carbajal	Horsford	Norcross
Cárdenas	Houlihan	O'Halleran
Carson	Hoyer	Ocasio-Cortez
Carter (LA)	Huffman	Omar
Cartwright	Jackson Lee	Pallone
Case	Jacobs (CA)	Panetta
Casten	Jayapal	Pappas
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Pascrell
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Payne
Cherfilus-	Johnson (TX)	Perlmutter
McCormick	Jones	Peters
Chu	Kahele	Phillips
Cicilline	Kaptur	Pingree
Clark (MA)	Keating	Pocan
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Porter
Cleaver	Khanna	Pressley
Clyburn	Kildee	Quigley
Cohen	Kilmer	Raskin
Connolly	Kim (NJ)	Rice (NY)
Cooper	Kind	Ross
Correa	Kirkpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Costa	Krishnamoorthi	Ruiz
Courtney	Kuster	Ruppersberger
Craig	Lamb	Rush
Crist	Langevin	Ryan
Crow	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes
Davids (KS)	Lawrence	Scanlon
Davis, Danny K.	Lawson (FL)	Schakowsky
Dean	Lee (CA)	Schiff
DeFazio	Lee (NV)	Schneider
DeGette	Leger Fernandez	Schrader
DeLauro	Levin (CA)	Schrier
DelBene	Levin (MI)	Scott (VA)
Demings	Lieu	Scott, David
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Sewell
Deutch	Lowenthal	Sherman
Dingell	Luria	Sherrill
Doggett	Lynch	Sires

Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozi
Swalwell
Takano

Aderholt
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Elizy
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Foa
Foa
Franklin, C.
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)

Allen
Conway
Kinzinger

Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey

NAYS—204

Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser

NOT VOTING—7

□ 1058

Mr. CHABOT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CLEAVER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Gomez)	Frankel, Lois	Newman (Beyer)
Auchincloss	(Kuster)	Palazzo
(Beyer)	Garcia (IL)	(Fleischmann)
Babin (Weber	(Beyer)	Pascrell
(TX))	Gimenez (Waltz)	(Pallone)
Barr (McHenry)	Gohmert (Weber	Payne (Pallone)
Barragán	(TX))	Porter (Neguse)
(Correa)	Gosar (Weber	Pressley
Boebert (Bishop	(TX))	(Trahan)
(NC))	Gottheimer	Rice (SC)
Bonamici (Beyer)	(Neguse)	(Meijer)
Bourdeaux	Guest	Rogers (KY)
(Correa)	(Fleischmann)	(Reschenthaler)
Bowman (Chu)	Hartzler (Bacon)	Rush (Neguse)
Brown (OH)	Hayes (Neguse)	Salazar (Diaz-
(Stevens)	Hice (GA)	Balart)
Bush (Williams	(Bishop (NC))	Sires (Pallone)
(GA))	Jacobs (NY)	Spartz
Cárdenas	(Smucker)	(Harshbarger)
(Gomez)	Jayapal (Gomez)	Stansbury
Carter (LA)	Jeffries (Neguse)	(Stevens)
(Williams	Johnson (GA)	Strickland
(GA))	(Williams	(Neguse)
Carter (TX)	(GA))	Suozi (Neguse)
(Weber (TX))	Johnson (TX)	Takano (Chu)
Casten (Foster)	(Stevens)	Taylor (Nehls)
Cawthorn	Katko (Meijer)	Timmons
(Donalds)	Keating (Neguse)	(Wilson (SC))
Cherfilus-	Khanna (Ocasio-	Tlaib (Gomez)
McCormick	Cortez	Underwood
(Williams	Kirkpatrick	(Neguse)
(GA))	(Pallone)	Van Drew
Cohen (Beyer)	Krishnamoorthi	(Reschenthaler)
Costa (Correa)	(Neguse)	Walorski (Baird)
Crist (Soto)	LaMalfa (Van	Wasserman
Davis, Danny K.	Duynne)	Schultz (Soto)
(Gomez)	Lawson (FL)	Watson Coleman
DeSaulnier	(Soto)	(Pallone)
(Beyer)	Manning (Bera)	Wilson (FL)
Doyle, Michael	McEachin	(Williams
F. (Pallone)	(Beyer)	(GA))
Espallat	Moore (WI)	Wittman (Carl)
(Correa)	(Beyer)	
Fletcher	Moulton	
(Pallone)	(Stevens)	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 203, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 298]

YEAS—217

Adams	Casten	Dingell
Aguilar	Castor (FL)	Doggett
Allred	Castro (TX)	Doyle, Michael
Auchincloss	Cherfilus-	F.
Axne	McCormick	Escobar
Barragán	Chu	Eshoo
Bass	Clark (MA)	Espallat
Beatty	Clarke (NY)	Evans
Bera	Cleaver	Fletcher
Beyer	Clyburn	Foster
Bishop (GA)	Cohen	Frankel, Lois
Blumenauer	Connolly	Gallego
Blunt Rochester	Cooper	Garamendi
Bonamici	Correa	Garcia (IL)
Bourdeaux	Costa	Garcia (TX)
Bowman	Courtney	Golden
Boyle, Brendan	Craig	Gomez
F.	Crist	Gonzalez,
Brown (MD)	Crow	Vicente
Brown (OH)	Cuellar	Gottheimer
Brownley	Davids (KS)	Green, Al (TX)
Bush	Davis, Danny K.	Grijalva
Bustos	Dean	Harder (CA)
Butterfield	DeFazio	Hayes
Carbajal	DeGette	Higgins (NY)
Cárdenas	DeLauro	Himes
Carson	DelBene	Horsford
Carter (LA)	Demings	Houlihan
Cartwright	DeSaulnier	Hoyer
Case	Deutch	Huffman

Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern

NAYS—203

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes

McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider

Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Nadler
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson

Cawthorn
Cicilline
Conway

Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons

NOT VOTING—9

Donalds
Kinzinger
Pence

Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dwyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack

□ 1115

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Gomez)
Auchincloss
(Beyer)
Babin (Weber
(TX))
Barr (McHenry)
Barragán
(Correa)
Boebert (Bishop
(NC))
Bonamici (Beyer)
Bourdeaux
(Correa)
Bowman (Chu)
Brown (OH)
(Stevens)
Bush (Williams
(GA))
Cárdenas
(Gomez)
Carter (LA)
(Williams
(GA))
Carter (TX)
(Weber (TX))
Casten (Foster)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
(Williams
(GA))
Cohen (Beyer)
Costa (Correa)
Crist (Soto)
Davis, Danny K.
(Gomez)
DeSaulnier
(Beyer)
Doyle, Michael
F. (Pallone)
Espallat
(Correa)
Fletcher
(Pallone)

Frankel, Lois
(Kuster)
García (IL)
(Beyer)
Gimenez (Waltz)
Gohmert (Weber
(TX))
Gottheimer
(Neguse)
Guest
(Fleischmann)
Hartzler (Bacon)
Hayes (Neguse)
Hice (GA)
(Bishop (NC))
Jacobs (NY)
(Smucker)
Jayapal (Gomez)
Jeffries (Neguse)
Johnson (GA)
(Williams
(GA))
Johnson (TX)
(Stevens)
Katko (Meijer)
Keating (Neguse)
Khanna (Ocasio-
Cortez)
Kirkpatrick
(Pallone)
Krishnamoorthi
(Neguse)
LaMalfa (Van
Dwyne)
Lawson (FL)
(Soto)
Manning (Bera)
McEachin
(Beyer)
Moore (WI)
(Beyer)
Moulton
(Stevens)

Newman (Beyer)
Palazzo
(Fleischmann)
Pascarell
(Pallone)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Neguse)
Pressley
(Trahan)
Rice (SC)
(Meijer)
Rogers (KY)
(Reschenthaler)
Rush (Neguse)
Salazar (Diaz-
Balart)
Sires (Pallone)
Spartz
(Harshbarger)
Stansbury
(Stevens)
Strickland
(Neguse)
Suozi (Neguse)
Takano (Chu)
Taylor (Nehls)
Timmons
(Wilson (SC))
Tlaib (Gomez)
Underwood
(Neguse)
Van Drew
(Reschenthaler)
Walorski (Baird)
Wasserman
Schultz (Soto)
Watson Coleman
(Pallone)
Wilson (FL)
(Williams
(GA))
Wittman (Carl)

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2022

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the adoption of House Resolution 1204, the Senate amendment to H.R. 4346 is considered as agreed to with an amendment consisting of the text of the Rules Committee print 117–53.

Senate amendment:
Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Salaries and Expenses”, \$10,300,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023, for expenses necessary to address threats to the Supreme Court of the United States.

TITLE II
THE JUDICIARY
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Salaries and Expenses”, \$9,100,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023, for expenses necessary to address threats to the Supreme Court of the United States.

TITLE III
GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS ACT

SEC. 301. Each amount appropriated or made available by this Act is in addition to amounts otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year involved.

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 303. Unless otherwise provided for by this Act, the additional amounts appropriated by this Act to appropriations accounts shall be available under the authorities and conditions applicable to such appropriations accounts for fiscal year 2022.

SEC. 304. Each amount provided by this Act is designated by Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4001(a)(1) and section 4001(b) of S. Con. Res. 14 (117th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2022.

This Act may be cited as the “Supreme Court Security Funding Act of 2022”.

The text of the House amendment to the Senate amendment is as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the cost of insulin, a lifesaving medication for the approximately 7,400,000 Americans who need it, is often prohibitive;

(2) in 2020, nearly 1 in 6 adults reported delaying, skipping, reducing the amount of, or otherwise not getting prescription drugs because of the costs of the drugs; and

(3) increased barriers to accessing necessary medication can lead to lower medication use and increase in cost of related hospitalizations and emergency room visits.

SEC. 2. ADDITION OF VACCINES AGAINST COVID-19 TO LIST OF TAXABLE VACCINES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4132(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(Q) Any vaccine against COVID-19.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) SALES, ETC.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to sales and uses on or after the later of—

(A) the first day of the first month which begins more than 4 weeks after the date of the enactment of this Act, or

(B) the date on which the Secretary of Health and Human Services lists any vaccine against COVID-19 for purposes of compensation for any vaccine-related injury or death through the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund.

(2) DELIVERIES.—For purposes of paragraph (1) and section 4131 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of sales on or before the effective date described in such paragraph for which delivery is made after such

date, the delivery date shall be considered the sale date.

CALLING FOR THE IMMEDIATE RELEASE OF BRITTNEY GRINER, A CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES, WHO WAS WRONGFULLY DETAINED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION IN FEBRUARY 2022

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the adoption of House Resolution 1204, H. Res. 1132 is hereby adopted.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1132

Whereas United States citizen Brittney Griner is a Women's National Basketball Association (WNBA) player;

Whereas Brittney Griner and her wife, Cherelle, are residents of Phoenix, Arizona, and are well-respected leaders in the community;

Whereas Brittney Griner was raised in Houston, Texas, and many of her family members live in Texas;

Whereas after a prolific collegiate career at her alma mater, Baylor University, Brittney Griner was the first overall pick in the 2013 WNBA by the Phoenix Mercury and has played her entire WNBA career with the team;

Whereas during her WNBA career, Brittney Griner has been named the WNBA Defensive Player of the Year twice and a WNBA All-Star seven times;

Whereas Brittney Griner has represented the United States on the women's basketball team twice and earned two Olympic Gold Medals;

Whereas Brittney Griner is also an international figure and has played for the Russian women's professional basketball team, UMMC Ekaterinburg, for the past seven years during the WNBA off-season;

Whereas Brittney Griner is a renowned leader in the LGBTQ+ community;

Whereas Brittney Griner has made a difference in the lives of many Arizonans, including through her annual "BG's Heart and Sole Shoe Drive" to provide shoes to those experiencing homelessness in the Phoenix community;

Whereas Brittney Griner's efforts have provided shoes to nearly 2,000 Phoenix-area residents in need;

Whereas the Phoenix Mercury and the Phoenix Rescue Mission are continuing this important effort in Brittney Griner's absence;

Whereas Brittney Griner was presumably detained by Russian authorities at Sheremetyevo Alexander S. Pushkin International Airport in Khimki, Russia, on February 17, 2022, accused of carrying vape cartridges with hashish oil;

Whereas Russian authorities opened a criminal case against Brittney Griner regarding the alleged transportation of drugs, which can carry a sentence of up to 10 years;

Whereas, on March 17, 2022, a Russian court denied a request for bail and for house arrest, and has since extended Brittney Griner's detention until June 18, 2022; and

Whereas the Department of State has determined that Brittney Griner is "wrongfully detained"; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) calls on the Government of the Russian Federation to immediately release Brittney Griner;

(2) urges the United States, in all interactions with the Government of the Russian

Federation, to raise the case of Brittney Griner and to press for her release;

(3) expresses continued support for Paul Whelan and all prisoners unjustly imprisoned in the Russian Federation;

(4) urges the Government of the Russian Federation to provide consular access to Brittney Griner while she remains in detention;

(5) urges the Government of the Russian Federation to respect the human rights of Brittney Griner; and

(6) expresses support to the family of Brittney Griner and a commitment to bringing her home.

KEEP KIDS FED ACT OF 2022

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1204, I call up the bill (S. 2089) to amend the Families First Coronavirus Response Act to extend child nutrition waiver authority, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment to the House amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment to the House amendment.

Senate amendment to House amendment:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Keep Kids Fed Act of 2022".

SEC. 2. SUPPORT FOR CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) **TEMPORARY LUNCH REIMBURSEMENT.**—Each lunch served under the school lunch program authorized under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) shall receive additional reimbursement in the amount of 40 cents.

(2) **TEMPORARY BREAKFAST REIMBURSEMENT.**—Each breakfast served under the school breakfast program established by section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773) shall receive additional reimbursement in the amount of 15 cents.

(3) **LIMITATION.**—The additional reimbursement amounts authorized under this subsection shall only be available for the school year beginning July 2022.

(4) APPROPRIATIONS.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—There is appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are necessary to carry out this subsection.

(B) **DISBURSEMENT.**—A State agency shall disburse funds made available under subparagraph (A) to school food authorities participating in the school meal programs described in paragraphs (1) and (2).

(b) **EXTENSION OF WAIVERS.**—Section 2202 of the Families First Coronavirus Response Act (42 U.S.C. 1760 note; Public Law 116–127) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting "due to the COVID-19 pandemic" after "(42 U.S.C. 1760(i))";

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking "and" after the semicolon and inserting "or"; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

"(B) ensuring continuity of program operation under a qualified program.";

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2); and

(B) by striking "the following:" in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and all that follows

through "A summary" in paragraph (1) and inserting "a summary"; and

(3) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

"(e) SUNSET.—

"(1) NATIONWIDE WAIVERS.—The authority of the Secretary to establish or grant a waiver under subsection (a) shall expire on September 30, 2022.

"(2) WAIVER RESTRICTION.—After June 30, 2022, a waiver established or granted under subsection (a) shall only apply to schools or summer food service program food service sites—

"(A) operating—

"(i) the qualified program described in subsection (f)(1)(D); or

"(ii) the option described in section 13(a)(8) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1761(a)(8)); and

"(B) not operating the qualified program described in subsection (f)(1)(A).

"(3) OTHER WAIVERS.—

"(A) CHILD AND ADULT CARE FOOD PROGRAM WAIVER.—The authority of the Secretary to establish or grant a waiver under subsection (b) shall expire on June 30, 2022.

"(B) MEAL PATTERN WAIVER.—The authority of the Secretary to establish or grant a waiver under subsection (c) shall expire on June 30, 2023.

"(4) LIMITATIONS.—A waiver authorized by the Secretary under this section shall not be in effect after the date on which the authority of the Secretary to establish or grant that waiver under this subsection expires."

(c) **APPROPRIATION.**—There are appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are necessary to provide waivers under section 2202(a) of the Families First Coronavirus Response Act (42 U.S.C. 1760 note; Public Law 116–127) that apply—

(1) only during the months of May through September in 2022; and

(2) to—

(A) the summer food service program for children under section 13 of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1761); or

(B) the option described in section 13(a)(8) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 1761(a)(8)).

(d) **NATIONWIDE WAIVER FOR SCHOOL YEAR 2022–2023.—**

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of school year 2022–2023, the Secretary of Agriculture may establish waivers under section 12(l) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1760(l))—

(A) on a nationwide basis; and

(B) without regard to the requirements under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of such section that a State or eligible service provider shall submit an application for a waiver request.

(2) **SUNSET.**—A nationwide waiver established by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 12(l) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1760(l)) pursuant to paragraph (1) shall not be in effect after June 30, 2023.

SEC. 3. CHILD AND ADULT CARE FOOD PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) **TEMPORARY ADDITIONAL REIMBURSEMENT FOR 2022–2023 SCHOOL YEAR.**—Each meal and supplement served under the program authorized by section 17 of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1766) shall receive additional reimbursement in the amount of 10 cents.

(2) **LIMITATION.**—The additional reimbursement amount authorized under paragraph (1) shall only be available for the school year beginning July 2022.

(b) **TIER DETERMINATIONS FOR 2022–2023 SCHOOL YEAR.**—For the school year beginning July 2022, a tier II family or group day care home described in subsection (f)(3)(A)(iii) of section 17 of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1766) shall be considered a tier I family or group day care home

for purposes of the program authorized under that section.

(c) **APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 4. RESCISSIONS AND SUNSET.

(a) **RESCISSIONS.**—

(1) **USDA.**—

(A) Of the unobligated balances from amounts made available to the Department of Agriculture in section 1001(a) of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (7 U.S.C. 7501 note; Public Law 117–2), \$1,000,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

(B) Of the unobligated balances from amounts made available to the Department of Agriculture in section 751 of division N of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (Public Law 116–260; 134 Stat. 2105), \$400,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

(2) **DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.**—Of the unobligated balances from amounts made available to the Department of Education in section 2003 of title II of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (Public Law 117–2; 135 Stat. 23) and allocated to institutions of higher education as defined in section 102(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002(b)), \$400,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

(3) **SBA.**—Of the unobligated balances from amounts made available to the Small Business Administration in section 5005 of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (Public Law 117–2; 135 Stat. 91) and in section 323(d)(1)(H) of division N of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (Public Law 116–260; 134 Stat. 2021) to carry out section 324 of such division of such Act (15 U.S.C. 9009a), \$1,200,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

(b) **ADDITIONAL RESCISSION.**—Of the unobligated balances from amounts made available to the Department of Agriculture under the heading “Agricultural Programs—Office of the Secretary” in title I of division B of the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (Public Law 116–136; 134 Stat. 505), \$600,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

(c) **SUNSET.**—Section 756 of division N of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (7 U.S.C. 2254c), is amended by striking “for fiscal year” and all that follows through “thereafter” and inserting “for each of fiscal years 2021 and 2022”.

SEC. 5. OPERATIONALLY READY.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall ensure that technical assistance is made available to States and school food authorities for purposes of assisting parents and school leaders with respect to the transition of operating school meal programs not pursuant to a waiver under section 2(d) or section 2202 of the Families First Coronavirus Response Act (42 U.S.C. 1760 note; Public Law 116–127).

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of Maryland). The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to S. 2089.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1204, the motion shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor or their designees.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the legislation currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are here, again, to pass legislation to ensure that our Nation's children have access to healthy meals. The Senate amended the bill that we passed yesterday, and so today we are going accept that amendment so the bill can be forwarded on to the President for signature.

S. 2089 would:

Maintain school meal flexibilities that do not increase costs;

Continue flexibilities to support summer food programs this year;

Provide additional support for child and adult care feeding programs; and

Increase school meal reimbursement rates for this upcoming school year.

We know this bill alone will not end hunger in America, nor does it uphold the stronger provisions in the bill that the House passed yesterday, but it is an important step to take for our Nation's children and to fulfill our basic responsibility to keep them from going hungry.

I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina, the ranking member of the committee, Dr. FOXX, for cooperating and making sure this legislation could come to the floor, along with the Senator STABENOW from Michigan and Senator BOOZMAN from Arkansas.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the motion, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Virginia yielding time. This is essentially the same bill we passed overwhelmingly yesterday, except it was improved by our colleagues in the Senate. This bill is a more targeted approach that includes temporary support for students and schools. It puts an end to the permanent pandemic narrative that led to unnecessary Federal programs with little return to taxpayers. For more than 2 years, broad nutrition waivers provided free meals to everyone, including wealthy families. This legislation returns these programs to regular order.

Most importantly, this bill is fully paid for. It is an example of respecting taxpayer funds, something the Federal Government is in short supply of.

Simply put, this bill puts our school nutrition programs back on track, so taxpayers, schools, and students are better served.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The reality is that Congress has reached its deadline. We must pass this critical legislation to ensure that children have healthy meals this summer and that schools and daycares have the funding and flexibilities they need to respond to the supply chain challenges and high food costs in the future.

If we do not act, we will jeopardize children's access to nutritious meals.

I wish, again, to thank the ranking member, Dr. FOXX, for her cooperation in bringing this bipartisan, bicameral legislation to the floor, along with Senators STABENOW and BOOZMAN.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support S. 2089, support the motion, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD for S. 2089, as amended, the following letters from the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, Feeding America, Save the Children, the School Nutrition Association, the Council of the Great City Schools, and the Center for Law and Social Policy in support of the Keep Kids Fed Act of 2022.

[June 21, 2022]

**PROTECT NUTRITION SECURITY FOR CHILDREN:
ACADEMY OF NUTRITION AND DIETETICS
WELCOMES NEW BIPARTISAN BILL**

CHICAGO—The Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics strongly supports the new Keep Kids Fed Act, introduced June 21 in Congress, as a crucial step in addressing nutrition security among school-aged children in the United States. The bill was introduced by U.S. Sens. Debbie Stabenow (Mich.) and John Boozman (Ark.) and U.S. Reps. Bobby Scott (Va.) and Virginia Foxx (N.C.).

“Studies have shown that the school cafeteria is the healthiest place for children to eat in the U.S.,” said registered dietitian nutritionist and the Academy's 2022–2023 President Ellen R. Shanley. “The Keep Kids Fed Act therefore is more important than ever in providing parents and guardians with the assurance that their children are receiving healthful meals to fuel them throughout this summer as well as the next school year.”

The Academy commends the Keep Kids Fed Act, which grants the U.S. Department of Agriculture the authority to provide temporary waivers that will provide full flexibilities to summer meal programs, eliminate the reduced-price meal category and increase reimbursement rates in response to rising food costs.

“The Academy and our members have tirelessly advocated for the continuation of child nutrition waivers as the country continues to grapple with ongoing supply chain and labor shortages due to the COVID-19 pandemic, as well as inflation,” Shanley said.

Because the pandemic has had a disproportionate impact on people from underrepresented communities and those with diet-related disease, access to healthful school meals promotes nutrition security as well as health equity.

While the Academy considers nutrition waivers to be a step in the right direction, the legislation comes late in the process as schools are organizing and operating summer meal programs and planning meal programs for the next school year.

“A better solution is to make school meals free for all children, all year,” Shanley said.

"The Academy has long advocated for Healthy School Meals for All and will continue to educate members of Congress on its benefits. We look forward to working with Congress on a permanent solution to issues of nutrition security for all, particularly for children."

[June 21, 2022]

FEEDING AMERICA APPLAUDS BI-PARTISAN STEP TO EXTEND CHILD NUTRITION WAIVERS
STATEMENT ATTRIBUTED TO VINCE HALL, CHIEF GOVERNMENT RELATIONS OFFICER

"Feeding America, the nation's largest hunger-relief network of 200 food banks, 21 statewide associations and 60,000 faith-based and non-profit partner food pantries and meal programs, applauds Congress for taking the needed steps to extend child nutrition waiver authority, which will help ensure children are able to access much-needed nutrition in the months ahead. Network food banks and partners have been asking for this continued flexibility for many months. The bi-partisan legislation, the Keep Kids Fed Act, was released today by Senators Debbie Stabenow (D-MI) and John Boozman (R-AR) and Representatives Bobby Scott (D-VA 03) and Virginia Foxx (R-NC 05) ahead of the June 30th deadline. The bill would provide temporary authority to USDA to provide summer meal program flexibilities, eliminate the reduced-price meal category, and increase reimbursement rates to help offset rising food costs. It will offer much needed stability, predictability, and an assurance that children will be better able to get the meals they need through the coming year. Together, these provisions will provide significant help for children who often do not know where they will get their next meal, particularly in communities of color who experience hunger at a disproportionate rate.

"Originally granted as part of the pandemic response to ensure access to meals for children in need during the school year and in the summertime, waivers allowing flexibilities for child nutrition program operators remain essential to addressing child food insecurity, particularly amid continued supply chain disruptions and ongoing barriers to reaching kids in rural areas. As it stands, schools and communities need continued flexibilities to safely plan for and offer summer meal programs and nutrition assistance during the next school year.

"For millions of school children, school meals are often their only reliable nutrition source. Feeding America stands ready to work with Congress to ensure this important bill passes both chambers and is signed by President Biden, and we look forward to working with them on future legislation to ensure child nutrition programs remain strong and responsive to local needs in the months and years ahead."

[June 22, 2022]

BIPARTISAN 'KEEP KIDS FED ACT' WOULD PREVENT MILLIONS OF CHILDREN FROM GOING HUNGRY

SAVE THE CHILDREN—TOGETHER WITH OUR POLITICAL ADVOCACY ARM, SAVE THE CHILDREN ACTION NETWORK—URGES CONGRESS TO SWIFTLY PASS THIS BIPARTISAN LEGISLATION

WASHINGTON, DC—After yesterday's release of the bipartisan Keep Kids Fed Act (H.R. 8150), Cassidy Pont, Lead Policy Advocate for Domestic Child Nutrition at Save the Children, issued the following statement:

"We wholeheartedly welcome the release of the bipartisan and budget-neutral Keep Kids Fed Act, which will temporarily extend some child nutrition waivers, preventing nearly 7 million children from losing access to nutritious meals this summer alone. In

the midst of increasing supply chain challenges and rising food and gas prices, this support will be a life-line for school nutrition programs and child care providers, enabling them to stay financially afloat while continuing to serve children the nutritious foods they need to grow, develop, learn and thrive. While we are disappointed the legislation doesn't extend the USDA Secretary's full waiver authority through the next school year, the Keep Kids Fed Act is an important step in the right direction. We urge Congress to act quickly to pass this legislation. If not, millions of children could go hungry, and we cannot let that happen."

[June 22, 2022]

SNA URGES PASSAGE OF SCHOOL MEALS AGREEMENT

ARLINGTON, VA—The School Nutrition Association (SNA) praised a new agreement to provide critical support to school meal programs prior to the expiration of federal pandemic waivers. Set to expire June 30, the waivers have ensured students can access healthy school meals despite persistent supply chain, food cost and labor burdens. SNA urges Congress to swiftly pass The Keep Kids Fed Act of 2022.

The \$3 billion package will provide the following assistance through School Year 2022/23:

Allow students eligible for reduced-price meals to receive free meals

Increase federal reimbursements for every school lunch by 40 cents and every school breakfast by 15 cents, above the annual inflationary adjustment scheduled for July 1

Extend no-cost waivers, including those for schools unable to meet nutrition standards due to supply chain disruptions and to reduce administrative and reporting burdens

Extend waivers for 2022 summer meal programs

"School nutrition professionals have withstood crippling supply chain breakdowns, rising prices and labor shortages in their efforts to provide students healthy meals, at a time when families are struggling with higher costs. With crucial federal waivers on the verge of expiring, this agreement offers school meal programs a lifeline to help build back toward normal operations," said SNA President Beth Wallace, MBA, SNS.

"SNA members are extremely grateful to Senate Agriculture Committee Chairwoman Debbie Stabenow, Ranking Member John Boozman, House Education and Labor Committee Chairman Bobby Scott and Ranking Member Virginia Foxx for their consistent efforts to support school meal programs and to Congressional leaders for bringing this critical agreement to the floor," said Wallace.

SNA members have reported an ongoing struggle to obtain sufficient food and supplies for their programs, as manufacturers discontinue products ranging from low-sodium chicken breasts to low-fat milk cartons and yogurt cups. Members have reported shortages of as many as 150-200 menu items per order, which send short-staffed school nutrition teams scrambling to secure healthy menu substitutions for their students. School nutrition directors across the country report unprecedented price increases, including a 280% increase in the cost of a case of gloves and 137% increase on whole grain bread.

"SNA appreciates ongoing efforts of U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack to address persistent supply chain challenges and USDA's commitment to avert penalties for schools unable to comply with meal pattern requirements due to these disruptions," said Wallace. "We will continue to work with USDA next school year as we seek solutions

to support school nutrition professionals and ensure the financial sustainability of meal programs for the students they serve."

SNA's 2022 Position Paper, released in January, urged Congress to extend pandemic-related child nutrition waivers and to permanently increase school meal reimbursement rates, offer free school meals to all students and ease regulatory requirements.

COUNCIL OF THE GREAT CITY SCHOOLS®,

Washington, DC, June 22, 2022.

Hon. BOBBY SCOTT,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. VIRGINIA FOXX,
Ranking Member, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SCOTT AND RANKING MEMBER FOXX: The Council of the Great City Schools, the coalition of the nation's largest central-city school districts, writes to offer our support for the Keep Kids Fed Act of 2022. Since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, urban districts have worked tirelessly to ensure that all of our students have safe access to healthy meal options, both during school closures and while on campus. Since March 2020, the COVID-19 waivers approved by Congress provided our Food Service departments with the additional funding and flexibility needed to get meals to students wherever they are and to deal with rising costs, personnel shortages, and supply chain issues.

Even though schools have been open this spring and are expecting to offer in-person instruction this fall, our child nutrition programs are still in crisis and have not returned to pre-pandemic normal. Supply chain and staffing issues persist and the need to relieve school districts from meal pattern, non-congregate feeding, and mealtime requirements remains essential. The Keep Kids Fed Act will provide school districts with the flexibility needed for continuity of operations next school year and offers additional funding to help serve more students and alleviate rising costs for meal items, food service supplies, and personnel.

With summer programs already operating and fall planning well-underway, school districts are facing enormous challenges in serving nutritious meals to students every day. The Council appreciates the bipartisan solutions offered in the Keep Kids Fed Act of 2022 to help mitigate some of these issues and urges a YES vote.

Sincerely,

RAY HART,
Executive Director.

THE CENTER FOR LAW
AND SOCIAL POLICY,
Washington, DC, June 23, 2022.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: The Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP) expresses our support for H.R. 8150, the Keep Kids Fed Act of 2022, which would extend key flexibilities for school meal provisions enacted under the Families First Coronavirus Response Act (FFCRA). As a national, nonpartisan anti-poverty organization that places racial equity at the center of our work, we understand how failing to extend this successful policy would harm food security in marginalized and low-income communities. The COVID-19 pandemic is ongoing, and schools are struggling to manage rising food costs and clogged supply chains. Congress' failure to extend the waivers and flexibilities the FFCRA provides would mean schools not having the tools they need to continue providing consistent and reliable meals to students. If Congress fails to extend these flexibilities beyond the current expiration date of

June 30, 2022, millions of children face the possibility of losing access to healthy meals.

CLASP is pleased to see the inclusion of the waiver ensuring all family child care homes qualify for the highest reimbursement rate under the Child and Adult Food Care (CACFP) program. This waiver eliminates the usual area eligibility requirement that limits this rate to providers in areas meeting a 50 percent low-income threshold. This threshold excludes many providers serving children in families with low incomes, especially in rural and suburban areas, where poverty is often less concentrated than in urban areas. In addition, the area eligibility test completely neglects providers and families struggling in areas with a high cost-of-living. CLASP recommends permanently eliminating the area eligibility test permanent. This change would bring more child care providers who serve low-income children into CACFP, ensuring many more children in need would receive healthy CACFP meals and snacks.

The COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated child hunger in the U.S., but did not create it. Prior to the pandemic, almost 1 in every 7 households struggled with food security, a rate that spiked to 1 in 3 with the onset of the pandemic. The policies enacted through the FFCRA, namely the nationwide waiver authority and expanded reimbursement rates, has enabled schools to meet the immense challenge of heightened demand and costs. As long as pandemic-related economic pressures remain, these flexibilities should as well. Many children in this country rely on meals through schools and child care programs as a source of reliable and nutritious food. These meals can support their development and represent a wise investment from policymakers. CLASP encourages Congress in the future to support universal school meals so that all students can receive the nutrition they need without stigma or burdensome paperwork.

CLASP thanks Sens. Stabenow and Boozman and Reps. Scott and Foxx for their bipartisan work on this important piece of legislation. CLASP urges swift passage and looks forward to working with your office on legislative matters reducing poverty in this country. For more information, or to help answer any questions, please contact Tralonne Shorter, Director of Legislative Affairs.

Sincerely,

INDIVAR DUTTA-GUPTA,
Executive Director.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, long overdue legislation to address gun violence in our schools and neighborhoods. Although this legislation is far from perfect, it is an important step forward in solving the epidemic of gun violence that has gripped our nation for decades.

In the weeks following the tragedy in Uvalde at Robb Elementary and the racist attack at a grocery store in Buffalo, I spoke with many constituents who continue to urge action. Teachers, parents, and concerned community members from Northwest Oregon shared pleas for Congress to follow through on our responsibility to our children and our nation by immediately passing bold policies to implement gun safety reform. An educator I know told me that after Uvalde, she sat down with her students and told them she would take a bullet for them. Conversations like this are happening in classrooms across the country, but they shouldn't have to. Congress must provide all students with safe learning environments free from the threat of gun violence.

The House already passed a comprehensive slate of gun violence prevention legislation, and I look forward to building on that by voting for this legislation that came out of the bipartisan Senate negotiations.

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act will help to protect Americans and make gun sales safer. The most effective way to protect communities from gun violence is to keep guns out of the hands of individuals who are a danger to themselves and others. This legislation will incentivize states to establish extreme risk protection order laws, enhance background checks for people under the age of 21, end straw purchasing, and penalize gun traffickers. It will also safeguard survivors of domestic violence by closing the so called "boyfriend loophole," prohibiting people convicted of domestic violence crimes from possessing firearms.

Additionally, this bill makes a robust investment in under Title IV-A of the Every Student Succeeds Act. Fully funding this important grant program will help to close the opportunity and resource gaps in our nation's public schools, and I'm pleased this bill recognizes the importance of this program in providing students of all backgrounds with a well-rounded, safe, and healthy education.

Although these actions to address gun violence in our communities and fund critical school improvement programs are important, I am concerned about how various provisions in the bill could harm Black and brown students and students with disabilities in our nation's schools. The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act increases funding for school resource officers (SROs) and codifies further involvement of the Department of Homeland Security in education through threat assessments. Research and practice show that both SROs and threat assessments are ineffective in keeping students safe in schools. As Chair of the Civil Rights and Human Services Subcommittee, I remain committed to protecting students' civil rights and delivering on the promise of an equitable, world-class public education for each and every student in this country. I will closely monitor the implementation of this legislation to make sure our most marginalized and vulnerable students are not subject to further disproportionate discipline and discriminatory targeting in schools.

As a member of the Gun Violence Prevention Taskforce, I again want to recognize how crucial the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act is to our schools, communities, and country. This bill will be the first substantive action on gun violence prevention since the passage of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act in 1994. In the last 30 years, our nation has been devastated over and over again by horrific tragedies like we saw in recent weeks at Robb Elementary in Uvalde, Texas. We cannot bring back those who have been murdered, but we can enact meaningful laws that will prevent more senseless deaths.

I urge swift passage of the legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1204, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

The motion to concur was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH WOODROW HATCHETT
UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE
AND FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1204, I call up the bill (S. 2938) to designate the United States Courthouse and Federal Building located at 111 North Adams Street in Tallahassee, Florida, as the "Joseph Woodrow Hatchett United States Courthouse and Federal Building", and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments to the House amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendments to the House amendment.

Senate amendments to House amendment:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SECTION 1. JOSEPH WOODROW HATCHETT UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE AND FEDERAL BUILDING.

(a) *DESIGNATION.*—The United States Courthouse and Federal Building located at 111 North Adams Street in Tallahassee, Florida, shall be known and designated as the "Joseph Woodrow Hatchett United States Courthouse and Federal Building".

(b) *REFERENCES.*—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States Courthouse and Federal Building referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Joseph Woodrow Hatchett United States Courthouse and Federal Building".

SEC. 2. LYNN C. WOOLSEY POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) *DESIGNATION.*—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 4th Street in Petaluma, California, shall be known and designated as the "Lynn C. Woolsey Post Office Building".

(b) *REFERENCES.*—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Lynn C. Woolsey Post Office Building".

SEC. 3. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the "Bipartisan Safer Communities Act".

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Joseph Woodrow Hatchett United States Courthouse and Federal Building.
Sec. 2. Lynn C. Woolsey Post Office Building.
Sec. 3. Short title; table of contents.

DIVISION A—MENTAL HEALTH AND FIREARMS PROVISIONS

TITLE I—CHILDREN AND FAMILY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Sec. 11001. Expansion of community mental health services demonstration program.
Sec. 11002. Medicaid and telehealth.
Sec. 11003. Supporting access to health care services in schools.
Sec. 11004. Review of State implementation of early and periodic screening, diagnostic, and treatment services.
Sec. 11005. Pediatric mental health care access grants.

TITLE II—FIREARMS

Sec. 12001. Juvenile records.
Sec. 12002. Defining "engaged in the business".
Sec. 12003. Use of Byrne grants for implementation of State crisis intervention programs.
Sec. 12004. Stop Illegal Trafficking in Firearms Act.

Sec. 12005. Misdemeanor crime of domestic violence.

TITLE III—OTHER MATTERS

Subtitle A—Extension of Moratorium

Sec. 13101. Extension of moratorium on implementation of rule relating to eliminating the anti-kickback statute safe harbor protection for prescription drug rebates.

Subtitle B—Medicare Improvement Fund

Sec. 13201. Medicare Improvement Fund.

Subtitle C—Luke and Alex School Safety Act of 2022

Sec. 13301. Short title.

Sec. 13302. Federal Clearinghouse on School Safety Evidence-based Practices.

Sec. 13303. Notification of clearinghouse.

Sec. 13304. Grant program review.

Sec. 13305. Rules of construction.

Subtitle D—Amendment on ESEA Funding

Sec. 13401. Amendment on ESEA funding.

DIVISION B—APPROPRIATIONS

DIVISION A—MENTAL HEALTH AND FIREARMS PROVISIONS

TITLE I—CHILDREN AND FAMILY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

SEC. 11001. EXPANSION OF COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

Section 223 of the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014 (42 U.S.C. 1396a note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) **ADDITIONAL PLANNING GRANTS FOR STATES.**—In addition to the planning grants awarded under paragraph (1), as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall award planning grants to States (other than States selected to conduct demonstration programs under paragraph (1) or (8) of subsection (d)) to develop proposals to participate in time-limited demonstration programs described in subsection (d) so that, beginning July 1, 2024, and every 2 years thereafter, up to 10 additional States may participate in the demonstration programs described in subsection (d) in accordance with paragraph (9) of that subsection.”;

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “September 30, 2023” and inserting “September 30, 2025”; and

(ii) by striking “Subject to paragraph (8)” and inserting “Subject to paragraphs (8) and (9)”;

(B) in paragraph (5)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “that is furnished” and inserting “that is furnished by a State participating in an ongoing demonstration program under this subsection”;

(ii) in subparagraph (C)(iii)—

(I) in subclause (I), by striking “September 30, 2023; and” and inserting “September 30, 2025;”;

(II) in subclause (II), by striking “under paragraph (8)” and all that follows through the period and inserting “under paragraph (8), during the first 24 fiscal quarter period (or any portion of such period) that the State participates in the demonstration program; and”;

(III) by adding at the end the following new subclause:

“(III) in the case of a State selected to participate in the demonstration program under paragraph (9), during the first 16 fiscal quarter period (or any portion of such period) that the State participates in the demonstration program.”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed as prohibiting a State that participated in a demonstration program under this subsection that has ended from receiving Federal financial participation under title XIX of the Social Security Act for amounts

expended by the State under a State plan under such title (or a waiver of such plan) for providing medical assistance for items and services, and carrying out activities, including continuing to pay for services under the prospective payment system established under subsection (c), that were provided or carried out by the State under the demonstration program, to the extent such financial participation is otherwise available under such title.”;

(C) in paragraph (7)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “through the year in which the last demonstration under this section ends” after “annually thereafter”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking “December 31, 2021” and inserting “September 30, 2025”; and

(II) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “Such recommendations shall include data collected after 2019, where feasible.”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) **FINAL EVALUATION.**—Not later than 24 months after all demonstration programs under this section have ended, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a final evaluation of such programs.”;

(D) in paragraph (8)(A), by striking “2 years” and all that follows through the period and inserting “6 years.”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(9) **FURTHER ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In addition to the States selected under paragraphs (1) and (8), the Secretary shall select any State that meets the requirements described in subparagraph (B) to conduct a demonstration program that meets the requirements of this subsection for 4 years.

“(B) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The requirements described in this subparagraph with respect to a State are that the State—

“(i) was awarded a planning grant under paragraph (1) or (3) of subsection (c); and

“(ii) submits an application (in addition to any application that the State may have previously submitted under this section) that includes the information described in paragraph (2)(B).

“(C) **REQUIREMENTS FOR SELECTED STATES.**—The requirements applicable to States selected under paragraph (8) pursuant to subparagraph (C) of such paragraph shall apply in the same manner to States selected under this paragraph.

“(D) **LIMITATION.**—The Secretary shall not select more than 10 States to conduct a demonstration program under this paragraph for each 2 fiscal year period.”; and

(3) in subsection (f)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period and inserting “; and”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) for purposes of awarding planning grants under subsection (c)(3), providing technical assistance to States applying for grants under such subsection, and carrying out demonstration programs under subsection (d), \$40,000,000 for fiscal year 2023, to remain available until expended.”.

SEC. 11002. MEDICAID AND TELEHEALTH.

(a) **GUIDANCE TO STATES ON FURNISHING SERVICES THROUGH TELEHEALTH UNDER MEDICAID AND CHIP.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide technical assistance and issue guidance to States on improving access to telehealth for services covered under Medicaid and CHIP, including with respect to:

(1) How States can adopt flexibilities under Medicaid and CHIP to expand access to covered services via telehealth, including when States may adopt such flexibilities without the need for approval of a State plan amendment or waiver.

(2) Best practices regarding billing for services, including recommended voluntary billing

codes, modifiers, and place of service designations and how such billing codes, modifiers, and designations can be used to create consistent data sets.

(3) Strategies for integrating telehealth services into value-based care models.

(4) Best practices from States that have used Medicaid waivers and other Medicaid authorities to expand access to telehealth, including during the COVID-19 public health emergency declared by the Secretary pursuant to section 319 of the Public Health Service Act on January 31, 2020, entitled “Determination that a Public Health Emergency Exists Nationwide as the Result of the 2019 Novel Coronavirus”, including any renewal of such declaration.

(5) Strategies to promote the delivery of accessible and culturally competent care via telehealth, including addressing the needs of individuals with disabilities, medically underserved urban and rural communities, racial and ethnic minorities such as American Indians and Alaska Natives, individuals with limited English proficiency, and individuals of different age groups including children, young adults, and seniors;

(6) Strategies for training and providing resources to providers and patients on the use of telehealth, including working with interpreters to furnish health services and providing resources in multiple languages.

(7) Integrating the use of existing video platforms that enable multi-person video calls.

(8) Best practices to support the delivery of covered services under Medicaid and CHIP via telehealth in schools, including specifically for the provision of mental health and substance use disorder services in such settings.

(9) Strategies for evaluating how the delivery of health services via telehealth affects quality, outcomes, and cost under Medicaid and CHIP.

(10) Best practices for conveying information to beneficiaries regarding the availability of telehealth as an option to receive services covered under Medicaid and CHIP, including the availability of audio-only telehealth, the ability to receive such services from a patient’s home, and requirements related to in-person visits.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **CHIP.**—The term “CHIP” means the State children’s health insurance program established under title XXI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397aa et seq.).

(2) **MEDICAID.**—The term “Medicaid” means the program established under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.).

(3) **SECRETARY.**—Except as otherwise provided, the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(4) **STATE.**—The term “State” has the meaning given that term in section 1101(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1301(a)(1)) for purposes of titles XIX and XXI of such Act.

SEC. 11003. SUPPORTING ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE SERVICES IN SCHOOLS.

(a) **GUIDANCE AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—

(1) **GUIDANCE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, shall issue guidance to State Medicaid agencies, local educational agencies, and school-based entities to support the delivery of medical assistance to Medicaid and CHIP beneficiaries in school-based settings.

(B) **REQUIRED INFORMATION.**—The guidance issued pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) include updates to the May 2003 Medicaid School-Based Administrative Claiming Guide, the 1997 Medicaid and Schools Technical Assistance Guide, and other relevant guidance in effect on the date of enactment of this Act;

(ii) clarify that payments may be made to school-based entities under Medicaid for delivering assistance under Medicaid, including any such assistance provided in accordance with an individualized education program or under the policy described in the State Medicaid Director letter on payment for services issued on December 15, 2014 (#14-006);

(iii) outline strategies and tools to reduce administrative burdens on, and simplify billing for, local educational agencies, in particular small and rural local educational agencies, and support compliance with Federal requirements regarding billing, payment, and recordkeeping, including by aligning direct service billing and school-based administrative claiming payment systems;

(iv) include a comprehensive list of best practices and examples of approved methods that State Medicaid agencies and local educational agencies have used to pay for, and increase the availability of, assistance under Medicaid, including expanding State programs to include all Medicaid-enrolled students, providing early and periodic screening, diagnostic, and treatment (EPSDT) services in schools, utilizing telehealth, coordinating with community-based mental health and substance use disorder treatment providers and organizations, coordinating with managed care entities, and supporting the provision of culturally competent and trauma-informed care in school settings; and

(v) provide examples of the types of providers (which may include qualified school health personnel) that States may choose to enroll, deem, or otherwise treat as participating providers for purposes of school-based programs under Medicaid and best practices related to helping such providers enroll in Medicaid for purposes of participating in school-based programs under Medicaid.

(2) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTER.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, shall establish a technical assistance center to—

(i) assist and expand the capacity of State Medicaid agencies and local educational agencies and school-based entities to provide assistance under Medicaid;

(ii) reduce administrative burdens for such agencies and health centers or entities;

(iii) support State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and school-based entities in obtaining payment for the provision of assistance under Medicaid;

(iv) ensure ongoing coordination and collaboration between the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Education with respect to the provision of, and payment for, assistance under Medicaid by local educational agencies; and

(v) provide information to State and local educational agencies and States on how to utilize funding from the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Education, and other Federal agencies to ensure payment under Medicaid for assistance provided in school-based settings.

(B) **SMALL AND RURAL SCHOOLS.**—The Secretary shall ensure that the technical assistance center includes resources which are specifically designed to help support small and rural local educational agencies in obtaining payment for the provision of assistance under Medicaid.

(C) **REPORTING.**—The technical assistance center shall, on a biennial basis, submit to the Secretary a report on the work of the center that identifies the areas where the most assistance was requested.

(3) **FUNDING.**—Out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, there is appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this subsection, \$8,000,000, for fiscal year 2022, to remain available until expended.

(b) **GRANTS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2022 for the Secretary to award grants to States for the purpose of implementing, enhancing, or expanding the provision of assistance through school-based entities under Medicaid or CHIP. A State shall not use any grant funds to provide medical assistance, child health assistance, or other health services.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section:

(1) **CHIP.**—The term “CHIP” means the State children’s health insurance program established under title XXI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397aa et seq.).

(2) **INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAM.**—The term “individualized education program” has the meaning given such term in section 602(14) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1401(14)).

(3) **MEDICAID.**—The term “Medicaid” means the program established under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.).

(4) **SCHOOL-BASED ENTITY.**—The term “school-based entity” means—

(A) a school-based health center, as that term is defined in section 2110(c)(9) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397jj(c)(9)); and

(B) an entity that provides medical assistance in a school-based setting for which Federal financial participation is allowed under Medicaid.

(5) **SECRETARY.**—Except as otherwise provided, the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(6) **STATE.**—The term “State” has the meaning given that term in section 1101(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1301(a)(1)) for purposes of titles XIX and XXI of such Act.

(7) **STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY; LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.**—The terms “State educational agency” and “local educational agency” have the meaning given those terms in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

SEC. 11004. REVIEW OF STATE IMPLEMENTATION OF EARLY AND PERIODIC SCREENING, DIAGNOSTIC, AND TREATMENT SERVICES.

(a) **REVIEW.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of Act, and every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary shall—

(A) review State implementation of the requirements for providing early and periodic screening, diagnostic, and treatment services under Medicaid in accordance with sections 1902(a)(43), 1905(a)(4)(B), and 1905(r) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(43), 1396d(a)(4)(B), 1396d(r)), including with respect to the provision of such services by managed care organizations, prepaid inpatient health plans, prepaid ambulatory health plans, and primary care case managers;

(B) identify gaps and deficiencies with respect to State compliance with such requirements;

(C) provide technical assistance to States to address such gaps and deficiencies; and

(D) issue guidance to States on the Medicaid coverage requirements for such services that includes best practices for ensuring children have access to comprehensive health care services, including children without a mental health or substance use disorder diagnosis.

(2) **REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 6 months after each date on which the Secretary completes the activities described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report on the most recent activities completed for purposes of such paragraph that includes the findings made, and descriptions of actions taken by the Secretary or by States as a result of such activities, and any additional actions the Secretary plans to carry out or that States are required to carry out as a result of such activities.

(3) **FUNDING.**—Out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, there is appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this subsection, to remain available until expended, \$5,000,000, for each of fiscal years 2023 and 2024, and \$1,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter.

(b) **GAO STUDY AND REPORT.**—

(1) **STUDY.**—The Comptroller General of the United States (in this subsection referred to as the “Comptroller General”) shall conduct a study evaluating State implementation under

Medicaid of the early and periodic screening, diagnostic, and treatment services benefit required for children by section 1905(a)(4)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(a)(4)(B)) and as defined in section 1905(r) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(r)) and provided in accordance with the requirements of section 1902(a)(43) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(43)), specifically with respect to State oversight of managed care organizations, prepaid inpatient health plans, prepaid ambulatory health plans, and primary care case managers, and shall provide recommendations as appropriate to improve State compliance with the requirements for providing such benefit, State oversight of managed care organizations, prepaid inpatient health plans, prepaid ambulatory health plans, and primary care case managers, and oversight of State programs under Medicaid by the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services.

(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under paragraph (1) that includes the recommendations required by such paragraph, as well as recommendations for such legislation and administrative action as the Comptroller General determines appropriate.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **MEDICAID.**—The term “Medicaid” means the program established under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.).

(2) **SECRETARY.**—Except as otherwise provided, the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(3) **STATE.**—The term “State” has the meaning given that term in section 1101(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1301(a)(1)) for purposes of titles XIX and XXI of such Act.

SEC. 11005. PEDIATRIC MENTAL HEALTH CARE ACCESS GRANTS.

Section 330M of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c–19) is amended—

(1) in the section enumerator, by striking “330M” and inserting “330M.”;

(2) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting “or cooperative agreements” after “award grants”; and

(B) by striking “Indian tribes and tribal organizations” and inserting “Indian Tribes and Tribal organizations”;

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “a grant” and inserting “an award”;

(ii) in subparagraph (G), by inserting “developmental-behavioral pediatricians,” after “psychiatrists,”;

(iii) in subparagraph (H), by inserting “provide information to pediatric health care providers about available mental health services for children in the community and” before “assist”; and

(iv) in subparagraph (I), by striking “problems” and inserting “conditions”;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3);

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) **SUPPORT TO SCHOOLS AND EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In addition to the activities required under paragraph (1), a pediatric mental health care access program referred to in subsection (a), with respect to which an award under such subsection may be used, may provide information, consultative support, training, and technical assistance to—

“(i) emergency departments; and

“(ii) State educational agencies, local educational agencies, Tribal educational agencies, and elementary and secondary schools.

“(B) **REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN RECIPIENTS.**—An entity receiving information, consultative support, training, and technical assistance under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall operate in a

manner consistent with, and shall ensure consistency with, the requirements of subsections (a) and (c) of section 4001 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act with respect to such information, consultative support, training, and technical assistance.”; and

(D) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated, by inserting “, and which may include a developmental-behavioral pediatrician” before the period at the end of the first sentence;

(4) in subsections (c), (d), and (f), by striking “Indian tribe, or tribal organization” each place it appears and inserting “Indian Tribe, or Tribal organization”;

(5) in subsections (c) and (d)—

(A) by striking “a grant” each place it appears and inserting “an award”; and

(B) by striking “such grant” each place it appears and inserting “such award”;

(6) in subsection (e), by striking “grants” and inserting “awards”;

(7) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking “award a grant” and inserting “make an award”; and

(B) by striking “the grant” and inserting “the award”;

(8) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h);

(9) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may—

“(1) provide, or continue to provide, technical assistance to recipients of awards under subsection (a); and

“(2) award a grant or contract to an eligible public or nonprofit private entity (as determined by the Secretary) for the purpose of providing such technical assistance pursuant to this subsection.”; and

(10) in subsection (h), as so redesignated, by striking “\$9,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2022” and inserting “\$31,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2027”.

TITLE II—FIREARMS

SEC. 12001. JUVENILE RECORDS.

(a) IMPROVING NICS EXAMINATION OF JUVENILE RECORDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (d)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “, including as a juvenile” after “such person”; and

(ii) in paragraph (4), by inserting “at 16 years of age or older” after “institution”; and

(B) in subsection (1)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in subparagraph (B)(ii)—

(aa) by inserting “subject to subparagraph (C),” before “3 business days”; and

(bb) by striking “and” at the end;

(II) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

(III) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) in the case of a person less than 21 years of age, in addition to all other requirements of this chapter—

“(i) the system provides the licensee with a unique identification number;

“(ii) 3 business days (meaning a day on which State offices are open) have elapsed since the licensee contacted the system, and the system has not notified the licensee that cause exists to further investigate a possibly disqualifying juvenile record under subsection (d); or

“(iii) in the case of such a person with respect to whom the system notifies the licensee in accordance with clause (ii) that cause exists to further investigate a possibly disqualifying juvenile record under subsection (d), 10 business days (meaning a day on which State offices are open) have elapsed since the licensee contacted the system, and the system has not notified the licensee that—

“(I) transferring the firearm to the other person would violate subsection (d) of this section; or

“(II) receipt of a firearm by the other person would violate subsection (g) or (n) of this section, or State, local, or Tribal law; and”;

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) by inserting “transfer or” before “receipt”; and

(II) by striking “(g) or (n)” and inserting “(d), (g), or (n) (as applicable)”;

(iii) in paragraph (4)—

(I) by inserting “transfer of a firearm to or” before “receipt”; and

(II) by striking “(g) or (n)” and inserting “(d), (g), or (n) (as applicable)”;

(iv) in paragraph (5)—

(I) by inserting “transfer of a firearm to or” before “receipt”; and

(II) by striking “(g) or (n)” and inserting “(d), (g), or (n) (as applicable)”.

(2) NICS REQUIREMENTS.—Section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (34 U.S.C. 40901) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO BACKGROUND CHECKS FOR PERSONS UNDER AGE 21.—If a licensee contacts the system established under this section regarding a proposed transfer of a firearm to a person less than 21 years of age in accordance with subsection (t) of section 922 of title 18, United States Code, the system shall—

“(1) immediately contact—

“(A) the criminal history repository or juvenile justice information system, as appropriate, of the State in which the person resides for the purpose of determining whether the person has a possibly disqualifying juvenile record under subsection (d) of such section 922;

“(B) the appropriate State custodian of mental health adjudication records in the State in which the person resides to determine whether the person has a possibly disqualifying juvenile record under subsection (d) of such section 922; and

“(C) a local law enforcement agency of the jurisdiction in which the person resides for the purpose of determining whether the person has a possibly disqualifying juvenile record under subsection (d) of such section 922;

“(2) as soon as possible, but in no case more than 3 business days, after the licensee contacts the system, notify the licensee whether cause exists to further investigate a possibly disqualifying juvenile record under subsection (d) of such section 922; and

“(3) if there is cause for further investigation, as soon as possible, but in no case more than 10 business days, after the licensee contacts the system, notify the licensee whether—

“(A) transfer of a firearm to the person would violate subsection (d) of such section 922; or

“(B) receipt of a firearm by the person would violate subsection (g) or (n) of such section 922, or State, local, or Tribal law.”.

(3) SUNSET OF REQUIREMENTS TO CONTACT STATE AND LOCAL ENTITIES.—Effective on September 30, 2032, paragraphs (1)(B) and (2) are repealed, and the provisions of law amended by those paragraphs are restored as if those paragraphs had not been enacted.

(b) REPORT ON REMOVING OUTDATED, EXPIRED, OR ERRONEOUS RECORDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On an annual basis for each fiscal year through fiscal year 2032, each State and Federal agency responsible for the submission of disqualifying records under subsection (d), (g), or (n) of section 922 of title 18, United States Code, to the national instant criminal background check system established under section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (34 U.S.C. 40901) shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report detailing the removal from the system of records that no longer prohibit an individual from lawfully acquiring or possessing a firearm under such subsection (d), (g), or (n).

(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted by a State or Federal agency under paragraph (1) shall include pertinent information on—

(A) the number of records that the State or Federal agency removed from the national instant criminal background check system established under section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (34 U.S.C. 40901) during the reporting period;

(B) why the records were removed; and

(C) for each record removed, the nature of the disqualifying characteristic outlined in subsection (d), (g), or (n) of section 922 of title 18, United States Code, that caused the State or Federal agency to originally submit the record to the system.

SEC. 12002. DEFINING “ENGAGED IN THE BUSINESS”.

Section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (21)(C), by striking “with the principal objective of livelihood and profit” and inserting “to predominantly earn a profit”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (22) through (29) as paragraphs (23) through (30), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (21) the following:

“(22) The term ‘to predominantly earn a profit’ means that the intent underlying the sale or disposition of firearms is predominantly one of obtaining pecuniary gain, as opposed to other intents, such as improving or liquidating a personal firearms collection: Provided, That proof of profit shall not be required as to a person who engages in the regular and repetitive purchase and disposition of firearms for criminal purposes or terrorism. For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘terrorism’ means activity, directed against United States persons, which—

“(A) is committed by an individual who is not a national or permanent resident alien of the United States;

“(B) involves violent acts or acts dangerous to human life which would be a criminal violation if committed within the jurisdiction of the United States; and

“(C) is intended—

“(i) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population;

“(ii) to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion; or

“(iii) to affect the conduct of a government by assassination or kidnapping.”.

SEC. 12003. USE OF BYRNE GRANTS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF STATE CRISIS INTERVENTION PROGRAMS.

(a) BYRNE JAG PROGRAM.—Section 501(a)(1) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10152(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “or civil proceedings” after “criminal justice”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(1) Implementation of State crisis intervention court proceedings and related programs or initiatives, including but not limited to—

“(i) mental health courts;

“(ii) drug courts;

“(iii) veterans courts; and

“(iv) extreme risk protection order programs, which must include, at a minimum—

“(I) pre-deprivation and post-deprivation due process rights that prevent any violation or infringement of the Constitution of the United States, including but not limited to the Bill of Rights, and the substantive or procedural due process rights guaranteed under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, as applied to the States, and as interpreted by State courts and United States courts (including the Supreme Court of the United States). Such programs must include, at the appropriate phase to prevent any violation of constitutional rights, at minimum, notice, the right to an in-person hearing, an unbiased adjudicator, the right to know opposing evidence, the right to present evidence, and the right to confront adverse witnesses;

“(II) the right to be represented by counsel at no expense to the government;

“(III) pre-deprivation and post-deprivation heightened evidentiary standards and proof which mean not less than the protections afforded to a similarly situated litigant in Federal court or promulgated by the State’s evidentiary body, and sufficient to ensure the full protections of the Constitution of the United States, including but not limited to the Bill of Rights, and the substantive and procedural due process rights guaranteed under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, as applied to the States, and as interpreted by State courts and United States courts (including the Supreme Court of the United States). The heightened evidentiary standards and proof under such programs must, at all appropriate phases to prevent any violation of any constitutional right, at minimum, prevent reliance upon evidence that is unsworn or unaffirmed, irrelevant, based on inadmissible hearsay, unreliable, vague, speculative, and lacking a foundation; and

“(IV) penalties for abuse of the program.”.

(b) **ANNUAL REPORT ON CRISIS INTERVENTION PROGRAMS.**—Section 501 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10152) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) **ANNUAL REPORT ON CRISIS INTERVENTION PROGRAMS.**—The Attorney General shall publish an annual report with respect to grants awarded for crisis intervention programs or initiatives under subsection (a)(1)(I) that contains—

“(1) a description of the grants awarded and the crisis intervention programs or initiatives funded by the grants, broken down by grant recipient;

“(2) an evaluation of the effectiveness of the crisis intervention programs or initiatives in preventing violence and suicide;

“(3) measures that have been taken by each grant recipient to safeguard the constitutional rights of an individual subject to a crisis intervention program or initiative; and

“(4) efforts that the Attorney General is making, in coordination with the grant recipients, to protect the constitutional rights of individuals subject to the crisis intervention programs or initiatives.”.

SEC. 12004. STOP ILLEGAL TRAFFICKING IN FIREARMS ACT.

(a) **ANTI-STRAW PURCHASING AND FIREARMS TRAFFICKING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§932. Straw purchasing of firearms

“(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section—

“(1) the term ‘drug trafficking crime’—

“(A) has the meaning given that term in section 924(c)(2); and

“(B) includes a felony punishable under the law of a State for which the conduct constituting the offense would constitute a felony punishable under the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 951 et seq.), or chapter 705 of title 46;

“(2) the term ‘Federal crime of terrorism’ has the meaning given that term in section 2332b(g)(5); and

“(3) the term ‘felony’ means any offense under Federal or State law punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year.

“(b) **VIOLATION.**—It shall be unlawful for any person to knowingly purchase, or conspire to purchase, any firearm in or otherwise affecting interstate or foreign commerce for, on behalf of, or at the request or demand of any other person, knowing or having reasonable cause to believe that such other person—

“(1) meets the criteria of 1 or more paragraphs of section 922(d);

“(2) intends to use, carry, possess, or sell or otherwise dispose of the firearm in furtherance of a felony, a Federal crime of terrorism, or a drug trafficking crime; or

“(3) intends to sell or otherwise dispose of the firearm to a person described in paragraph (1) or (2).

“(c) **PENALTY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), any person who violates subsection (b) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 15 years, or both.

“(2) **USE IN FELONIES, CRIMES OF TERRORISM, OR DRUG TRAFFICKING CRIMES.**—If a violation of subsection (b) is committed knowing or with reasonable cause to believe that any firearm involved will be used to commit a felony, a Federal crime of terrorism, or a drug trafficking crime, the person shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of not more than 25 years.

“§933. Trafficking in firearms

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—It shall be unlawful for any person to—

“(1) ship, transport, transfer, cause to be transported, or otherwise dispose of any firearm to another person in or otherwise affecting interstate or foreign commerce, if such person knows or has reasonable cause to believe that the use, carrying, or possession of a firearm by the recipient would constitute a felony (as defined in section 932(a));

“(2) receive from another person any firearm in or otherwise affecting interstate or foreign commerce, if the recipient knows or has reasonable cause to believe that such receipt would constitute a felony; or

“(3) attempt or conspire to commit the conduct described in paragraph (1) or (2).

“(b) **PENALTY.**—Any person who violates subsection (a) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 15 years, or both.

“§934. Forfeiture and fines

“(a) **FORFEITURE.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any person convicted of a violation of section 932 or 933 shall forfeit to the United States, irrespective of any provision of State law—

“(A) any property constituting, or derived from, any proceeds the person obtained, directly or indirectly, as the result of such violation; and

“(B) any of the person’s property used, or intended to be used, in any manner or part, to commit, or to facilitate the commission of, such violation, except that for any forfeiture of any firearm or ammunition pursuant to this section, section 924(d) shall apply.

“(2) **IMPOSITION.**—The court, in imposing sentence on a person convicted of a violation of section 932 or 933, shall order, in addition to any other sentence imposed pursuant to section 932 or 933, that the person forfeit to the United States all property described in paragraph (1).

“(b) **FINES.**—A defendant who derives profits or other proceeds from an offense under section 932 or 933 may be fined not more than the greater of—

“(1) the fine otherwise authorized by this part; or

“(2) the amount equal to twice the gross profits or other proceeds of the offense under section 932 or 933.”.

(2) **TITLE III AUTHORIZATION.**—Section 2516(1)(n) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “sections 922 and 924” and inserting “section 922, 924, 932, or 933”.

(3) **RACKETEERING AMENDMENT.**—Section 1961(1)(B) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “section 932 (relating to straw purchasing), section 933 (relating to trafficking in firearms),” before “section 1028”.

(4) **MONEY LAUNDERING AMENDMENT.**—Section 1956(c)(7)(D) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 924(n)” and inserting “section 924(n), 932, or 933”.

(5) **DIRECTIVE TO SENTENCING COMMISSION.**—Pursuant to its authority under section 994 of title 28, United States Code, and in accordance with this subsection, the United States Sentencing Commission shall review and amend its guidelines and policy statements to ensure that persons convicted of an offense under section

932 or 933 of title 18, United States Code, and other offenses applicable to the straw purchases and trafficking of firearms are subject to increased penalties in comparison to those currently provided by the guidelines and policy statements for such straw purchasing and trafficking of firearms offenses. In its review, the Commission shall consider, in particular, an appropriate amendment to reflect the intent of Congress that straw purchasers without significant criminal histories receive sentences that are sufficient to deter participation in such activities and reflect the defendant’s role and culpability, and any coercion, domestic violence survivor history, or other mitigating factors. The Commission shall also review and amend its guidelines and policy statements to reflect the intent of Congress that a person convicted of an offense under section 932 or 933 of title 18, United States Code, who is affiliated with a gang, cartel, organized crime ring, or other such enterprise should be subject to higher penalties than an otherwise unaffiliated individual.

(6) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“932. Straw purchasing of firearms.

“933. Trafficking in firearms.

“934. Forfeiture and fines.”.

(b) **AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 922(d).**—Section 922(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by striking the matter following paragraph (9) and inserting the following:

“(10) intends to sell or otherwise dispose of the firearm or ammunition in furtherance of a felony, a Federal crime of terrorism, or a drug trafficking offense (as such terms are defined in section 932(a)); or

“(11) intends to sell or otherwise dispose of the firearm or ammunition to a person described in any of paragraphs (1) through (10).

This subsection shall not apply with respect to the sale or disposition of a firearm or ammunition to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector who pursuant to subsection (b) of section 925 is not precluded from dealing in firearms or ammunition, or to a person who has been granted relief from disabilities pursuant to subsection (c) of section 925.”.

(c) **AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 924(a).**—Section 924(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “(d), (g),”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) Whoever knowingly violates subsection (d) or (g) of section 922 shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 15 years, or both.”.

(d) **AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 924(d).**—Section 924(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “932, or 933,” after “section 924.”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (E), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) any offense under section 932 or 933.”.

(e) **AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 924(h).**—Section 924 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (h) and inserting the following:

“(h) Whoever knowingly receives or transfers a firearm or ammunition, or attempts or conspires to do so, knowing or having reasonable cause to believe that such firearm or ammunition will be used to commit a felony, a Federal

crime of terrorism, or a drug trafficking crime (as such terms are defined in section 932(a)), or a crime under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.), the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 (50 U.S.C. 4801 et seq.), the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), or the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act (21 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.), shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 15 years, or both.”.

(f) AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 924(k).—Section 924 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (k) and inserting the following:

“(k)(1) A person who smuggles or knowingly brings into the United States a firearm or ammunition, or attempts or conspires to do so, with intent to engage in or to promote conduct that—

“(A) is punishable under the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 951 et seq.), or chapter 705 of title 46; or

“(B) constitutes a felony, a Federal crime of terrorism, or a drug trafficking crime (as such terms are defined in section 932(a)), shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 15 years, or both.

“(2) A person who smuggles or knowingly takes out of the United States a firearm or ammunition, or attempts or conspires to do so, with intent to engage in or to promote conduct that—

“(A) would be punishable under the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 951 et seq.), or chapter 705 of title 46, if the conduct had occurred within the United States; or

“(B) would constitute a felony or a Federal crime of terrorism (as such terms are defined in section 932(a)) for which the person may be prosecuted in a court of the United States, if the conduct had occurred within the United States, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 15 years, or both.”.

(g) PROHIBITION ON FIREARMS OR AMMUNITION TRANSFERS TO AGENTS OF DRUG CARTELS.—The Department of Justice, and any of its law enforcement coordinate agencies, shall not conduct or otherwise facilitate the transfer of an operable firearm or ammunition to an individual if any law enforcement officer employed by the Department of Justice involved with the transfer knows or has reasonable cause to believe that the recipient of the firearm or ammunition is an agent of a drug cartel, unless law enforcement personnel of the United States continuously monitor or control the firearm or ammunition at all times.

(h) FFL ACCESS TO LAW ENFORCEMENT INFORMATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 103(b) of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (34 U.S.C. 40901(b)), is amended—

(A) by striking “Not later than” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) VOLUNTARY BACKGROUND CHECKS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Attorney General shall promulgate regulations allowing licensees to use the national instant criminal background check system established under this section for purposes of voluntarily conducting an employment background check relating to a current or prospective employee. The Attorney General may not collect a fee for an employment background check under this subparagraph.

“(B) NOTICE.—Before conducting an employment background check relating to a current or prospective employee under subparagraph (A), a licensee shall—

“(i) provide written notice to the current or prospective employee that the licensee intends to conduct the background check; and

“(ii) obtain consent to conduct the background check from the current or prospective employee in writing.

“(C) EXEMPTION.—An employment background check conducted by a licensee under

subparagraph (A) shall not be governed by the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.).

“(D) APPEAL.—Any individual who is the subject of an employment background check conducted by a licensee under subparagraph (A) the result of which indicates that the individual is prohibited from possessing a firearm or ammunition pursuant to subsection (g) or (n) of section 922 of title 18, United States Code, may appeal the results of the background check in the same manner and to the same extent as if the individual had been the subject of a background check relating to the transfer of a firearm.”.

(2) ACQUISITION, PRESERVATION, AND EXCHANGE OF IDENTIFICATION RECORDS AND INFORMATION.—Section 534 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(iii) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) provide a person licensed as an importer, manufacturer, or dealer of firearms under chapter 44 of title 18 with information necessary to verify whether firearms offered for sale to such licensees have been stolen.”; and

(B) in subsection (b), by inserting “, except for dissemination authorized under subsection (a)(5) of this section” before the period.

(3) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and without regard to chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, the Attorney General shall promulgate regulations allowing a person licensed as an importer, manufacturer, or dealer of firearms under chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to receive access to records of stolen firearms maintained by the National Crime Information Center operated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, solely for the purpose of voluntarily verifying whether firearms offered for sale to such licensees have been stolen.

(4) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION; EVIDENCE.—

(A) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection or the amendments made by this subsection shall be construed—

(i) to create a cause of action against any person licensed as an importer, manufacturer, or dealer of firearms under chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, or any other person for any civil liability; or

(ii) to establish any standard of care.

(B) EVIDENCE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, evidence regarding the use or non-use by a person licensed as an importer, manufacturer, or dealer of firearms under chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, of the systems, information, or records made available under this subsection or the amendments made by this subsection shall not be admissible as evidence in any proceeding of any court, agency, board, or other entity.

(i) FUNDING FOR EXISTING ATF ANTI-STRAW PURCHASING CAMPAIGN.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives \$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2027 to continue and expand current efforts with existing partners to educate persons licensed as an importer, manufacturer, or dealer of firearms under chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, and the public to combat illegal straw purchases of firearms.

(j) LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT REIMBURSEMENT FOR ASSISTANCE PROVIDED TO DHS-HSI TO PREVENT ILLEGAL TRAFFICKING.—Section 432(d)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 240(d)(2)) is amended by inserting “salary reimbursement,” after “administrative.”.

(k) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section, or an amendment made by this section, shall be construed to allow the establishment of a Federal system of registration of firearms, firearms owners, or firearms transactions or dispositions.

SEC. 12005. MISDEMEANOR CRIME OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.

(a) DEFINING “DATING RELATIONSHIP”.—Section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (33)(A)(ii)—

(A) by striking “or by a person” and inserting “by a person”; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, or by a person who has a current or recent former dating relationship with the victim”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(37)(A) The term ‘dating relationship’ means a relationship between individuals who have or have recently had a continuing serious relationship of a romantic or intimate nature.

“(B) Whether a relationship constitutes a dating relationship under subparagraph (A) shall be determined based on consideration of—

“(i) the length of the relationship;

“(ii) the nature of the relationship; and

“(iii) the frequency and type of interaction between the individuals involved in the relationship.

“(C) A casual acquaintanceship or ordinary fraternization in a business or social context does not constitute a dating relationship under subparagraph (A).”.

(b) NO RETROACTIVE APPLICATION.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall not apply to any conviction of a misdemeanor crime of domestic violence entered before the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) LIMITATIONS ON CONVICTIONS OF CRIMES OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE WITH RESPECT TO DATING RELATIONSHIPS.—Section 921(a)(33) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “subparagraph (C)” and inserting “subparagraphs (B) and (C)”; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking “State,” and inserting “State,”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) A person shall not be considered to have been convicted of a misdemeanor crime of domestic violence against an individual in a dating relationship for purposes of this chapter if the conviction has been expunged or set aside, or is an offense for which the person has been pardoned or has had firearm rights restored unless the expungement, pardon, or restoration of rights expressly provides that the person may not ship, transport, possess, or receive firearms: Provided, That, in the case of a person who has not more than 1 conviction of a misdemeanor crime of domestic violence against an individual in a dating relationship, and is not otherwise prohibited under this chapter, the person shall not be disqualified from shipping, transport, possession, receipt, or purchase of a firearm under this chapter if 5 years have elapsed from the later of the judgment of conviction or the completion of the person’s custodial or supervisory sentence, if any, and the person has not subsequently been convicted of another such offense, a misdemeanor under Federal, State, Tribal, or local law which has, as an element, the use or attempted use of physical force, or the threatened use of a deadly weapon, or any other offense that would disqualify the person under section 922(g). The national instant criminal background check system established under section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (34 U.S.C. 40901) shall be updated to reflect the status of the person. Restoration under this subparagraph is not available for a current or former spouse, parent, or guardian of the victim, a person with whom the victim shares a child in common, a person who is cohabiting with or has cohabited with the victim as a spouse, parent, or guardian, or a person similarly situated to a spouse, parent, or guardian of the victim.”.

TITLE III—OTHER MATTERS**Subtitle A—Extension of Moratorium****SEC. 13101. EXTENSION OF MORATORIUM ON IMPLEMENTATION OF RULE RELATING TO ELIMINATING THE ANTI-KICKBACK STATUTE SAFE HARBOR PROTECTION FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUG REBATES.**

Section 9006 of division I of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (42 U.S.C. 1320a-7b note) is amended by striking “January 1, 2026” and inserting “January 1, 2027”.

Subtitle B—Medicare Improvement Fund**SEC. 13201. MEDICARE IMPROVEMENT FUND.**

Section 1898(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395iii(b)(1)) is amended by striking “fiscal year 2021, \$5,000,000” and inserting “fiscal year 2022, \$7,500,000,000”.

Subtitle C—Luke and Alex School Safety Act of 2022**SEC. 13301. SHORT TITLE.**

This subtitle may be cited as the “Luke and Alex School Safety Act of 2022”.

SEC. 13302. FEDERAL CLEARINGHOUSE ON SCHOOL SAFETY EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title XXII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 651 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 2220D. FEDERAL CLEARINGHOUSE ON SCHOOL SAFETY EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Education, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall establish a Federal Clearinghouse on School Safety Evidence-based Practices (in this section referred to as the ‘Clearinghouse’) within the Department.

“(2) PURPOSE.—The Clearinghouse shall serve as a Federal resource to identify and publish online through SchoolSafety.gov, or any successor website, evidence-based practices and recommendations to improve school safety for use by State and local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, State and local law enforcement agencies, health professionals, and the general public.

“(3) PERSONNEL.—

“(A) ASSIGNMENTS.—The Clearinghouse shall be assigned such personnel and resources as the Secretary considers appropriate to carry out this section.

“(B) DETAILEES.—The Secretary of Education, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services may detail personnel to the Clearinghouse.

“(4) EXEMPTIONS.—

“(A) PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT.—Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Paperwork Reduction Act’), shall not apply to any rulemaking or information collection required under this section.

“(B) FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply for the purposes of carrying out this section.

“(b) CLEARINGHOUSE CONTENTS.—

“(1) CONSULTATION.—In identifying the evidence-based practices and recommendations for the Clearinghouse, the Secretary shall—

“(A) consult with appropriate Federal, State, local, Tribal, private sector, and nongovernmental organizations, including civil rights and disability rights organizations; and

“(B) consult with the Secretary of Education to ensure that evidence-based practices published by the Clearinghouse are aligned with evidence-based practices to support a positive and safe learning environment for all students.

“(2) CRITERIA FOR EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—The evidence-based practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse shall—

“(A) include comprehensive evidence-based school safety measures;

“(B) include the evidence or research rationale supporting the determination of the Clearinghouse that the evidence-based practice or recommendation under subparagraph (A) has been shown to have a significant effect on improving the health, safety, and welfare of persons in school settings, including—

“(i) relevant research that is evidence-based, as defined in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801), supporting the evidence-based practice or recommendation;

“(ii) findings and data from previous Federal or State commissions recommending improvements to the safety posture of a school; or

“(iii) other supportive evidence or findings relied upon by the Clearinghouse in determining evidence-based practices and recommendations, as determined in consultation with the officers described in subsection (a)(3)(B);

“(C) include information on Federal programs for which implementation of each evidence-based practice or recommendation is an eligible use for the program;

“(D) be consistent with Federal civil rights laws, including title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12131 et seq.), the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 701 et seq.), and title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.); and

“(E) include options for developmentally appropriate recommendations for use in educational settings with respect to children’s ages and physical, social, sensory, and emotionally developmental statuses.

“(3) PAST COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Clearinghouse shall present, as determined in consultation with the officers described in subsection (a)(3)(B), Federal, State, local, Tribal, private sector, and nongovernmental organizations issued best practices and recommendations and identify any best practice or recommendation of the Clearinghouse that was previously issued by any such organization or commission.

“(c) ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.—The Secretary may produce and publish materials on the Clearinghouse to assist and train educational agencies and law enforcement agencies on the implementation of the evidence-based practices and recommendations.

“(d) CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT.—The Secretary shall—

“(1) collect for the purpose of continuous improvement of the Clearinghouse—

“(A) Clearinghouse data analytics;

“(B) user feedback on the implementation of resources, evidence-based practices, and recommendations identified by the Clearinghouse; and

“(C) any evaluations conducted on implementation of the evidence-based practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse; and

“(2) in coordination with the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Attorney General—

“(A) regularly assess and identify Clearinghouse evidence-based practices and recommendations for which there are no resources available through Federal Government programs for implementation; and

“(B) establish an external advisory board, which shall be comprised of appropriate State, local, Tribal, private sector, and nongovernmental organizations, including organizations representing parents of elementary and secondary school students, representative from civil rights organizations, representatives of disability rights organizations, representatives of educators, representatives of law enforcement, and nonprofit school safety and security organizations, to—

“(i) provide feedback on the implementation of evidence-based practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse; and

“(ii) propose additional recommendations for evidence-based practices for inclusion in the

Clearinghouse that meet the requirements described in subsection (b)(2)(B).

“(e) PARENTAL ASSISTANCE.—The Clearinghouse shall produce materials in accessible formats to assist parents and legal guardians of students with identifying relevant Clearinghouse resources related to supporting the implementation of Clearinghouse evidence-based practices and recommendations.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-296; 116 Stat. 2135) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“Sec. 2220D. Federal Clearinghouse on School Safety Evidence-based Practices.”.

SEC. 13303. NOTIFICATION OF CLEARINGHOUSE.

(a) NOTIFICATION BY THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION.—The Secretary of Education shall provide written notification of the publication of the Federal Clearinghouse on School Safety Evidence-based Practices (referred to in this section and section 13304 as the ‘Clearinghouse’), as required to be established under section 2220D of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 13302 of this Act, to—

(1) every State and local educational agency; and

(2) other Department of Education partners in the implementation of the evidence-based practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse, as determined appropriate by the Secretary of Education.

(b) NOTIFICATION BY THE SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide written notification of the publication of the Clearinghouse, as required to be established under section 2220D of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 13302 of this Act, to—

(1) every State homeland security advisor;

(2) every State department of homeland security; and

(3) other Department of Homeland Security partners in the implementation of the evidence-based practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse, as determined appropriate by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(c) NOTIFICATION BY THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall provide written notification of the publication of the Clearinghouse, as required to be established under section 2220D of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 13302 of this Act, to—

(1) every State department of public health; and

(2) other Department of Health and Human Services partners in the implementation of the evidence-based practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse, as determined appropriate by the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(d) NOTIFICATION BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall provide written notification of the publication of the Clearinghouse, as required to be established under section 2220D of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 13302 of this Act, to—

(1) every State department of justice; and

(2) other Department of Justice partners in the implementation of the evidence-based practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse, as determined appropriate by the Attorney General.

SEC. 13304. GRANT PROGRAM REVIEW.

(a) FEDERAL GRANTS AND RESOURCES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Clearinghouse or the external advisory board established under section 2220D of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by this subtitle, shall—

(1) review grant programs and identify any grant program that may be used to implement evidence-based practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse;

(2) identify any evidence-based practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse for which there is not a Federal grant program that may be used for the purposes of implementing the evidence-based practice or recommendation as applicable to the agency; and

(3) periodically report any findings under paragraph (2) to the appropriate committees of Congress.

(b) **STATE GRANTS AND RESOURCES.**—The Clearinghouse shall, to the extent practicable, identify, for each State—

(1) each agency responsible for school safety in the State, or any State that does not have such an agency designated;

(2) any grant program that may be used for the purposes of implementing evidence-based practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse; and

(3) any resources other than grant programs that may be used to assist in implementation of evidence-based practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse.

SEC. 13305. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) **WAIVER OF REQUIREMENTS.**—Nothing in this subtitle or the amendments made by this subtitle shall be construed to create, satisfy, or waive any requirement under—

(1) title II of the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12131 et seq.);

(2) the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 701 et seq.);

(3) title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.);

(4) title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.); or

(5) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 (42 U.S.C. 6101 et seq.).

(b) **PROHIBITION ON FEDERALLY DEVELOPED, MANDATED, OR ENDORSED CURRICULUM.**—Nothing in this subtitle or the amendments made by this subtitle shall be construed to authorize any officer or employee of the Federal Government to engage in an activity otherwise prohibited under section 103(b) of the Department of Education Organization Act (20 U.S.C. 3403(b)).

Subtitle D—Amendment on ESEA Funding

SEC. 13401. AMENDMENT ON ESEA FUNDING.

Section 8526 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7906) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking “or” after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) for the provision to any person of a dangerous weapon, as defined in section 930(g)(2) of title 18, United States Code, or training in the use of a dangerous weapon.”.

DIVISION B—APPROPRIATIONS

The following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Salaries and Expenses”, \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended, to meet additional resource needs of the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES

OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS

STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for “State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance”, \$1,400,000,000, to remain available until expended, for grants to be administered by the Office of Justice Programs: Provided, That \$280,000,000, to remain available until expended,

shall be made available for fiscal year 2022, \$280,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be made available for fiscal year 2023, \$280,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be made available for fiscal year 2024, \$280,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be made available for fiscal year 2025, and \$280,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be made available for fiscal year 2026: Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading in this Act, the following amounts shall be for the following purposes in equal amounts for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026—

(1) \$750,000,000 shall be awarded pursuant to the formula allocation (adjusted in proportion to the relative amounts statutorily designated therefor) that was used in the fiscal year prior to the year for which funds are provided for the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant program, as authorized by subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Acts of 1968 (Public Law 90–351) (the “1968 Act”), and shall be for the purposes described in section 501(a)(1)(I) of title I of the 1968 Act, as amended by title II of division A of this Act: Provided further, That the allocation provisions under sections 505(a) through (e), the special rules for Puerto Rico under section 505(g), and section 1001(c) of title I of the 1968 Act shall not apply to the amount described in this paragraph;

(2) \$200,000,000 shall be for grants administered by the Bureau of Justice Assistance for purposes authorized under the STOP School Violence Act of 2018 (title V of division S of Public Law 115–141);

(3) \$200,000,000 shall be for grants to the States to upgrade criminal and mental health records for the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, including grants to assist States in providing disqualifying juvenile records under subsection (g) or (n) of section 922 of title 18, United States Code: Provided further, That the grants described in this paragraph shall be available to State criminal record repositories and State court systems; and

(4) \$250,000,000 shall be for a community violence intervention and prevention initiative.

COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES

COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for “Community Oriented Policing Services Programs”, \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended, for competitive grants to be administered by the Community Oriented Policing Services Office for purposes authorized under the STOP School Violence Act of 2018 (title V of division S of Public Law 115–141): Provided, That \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be made available for fiscal year 2022, \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be made available for fiscal year 2023, \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be made available for fiscal year 2024, \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be made available for fiscal year 2025, and \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be made available for fiscal year 2026.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 21001. None of the funds made available by this title may be transferred in this or any future fiscal year pursuant to the authority in section 205 of the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2022, or any successor provision in a subsequently enacted appropriations Act.

SEC. 21002. (a) The Department of Justice shall provide a detailed spend plan for the fiscal year 2022 and 2023 funds made available in this title to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate within 45 days after the enactment of this Act and, for each of fiscal years 2024 through 2026, as part of the annual budget submission of the President

under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the Attorney General shall submit a detailed spend plan for the funds made available in this title in that fiscal year.

(b) The spend plan described in subsection (a) shall include a specific and detailed description of the intended administration, review processes, allowable purposes, eligibility requirements, and priority areas or weightings for the grant programs funded in this title.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

HEALTH SURVEILLANCE AND PROGRAM SUPPORT

For an additional amount for “Health Surveillance and Program Support”, \$800,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2025: Provided, That \$312,500,000, to remain available until December 31, 2022, shall be made available for fiscal year 2022, \$162,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023, shall be made available for fiscal year 2023, \$162,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2024, shall be made available for fiscal year 2024, and \$162,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2025, shall be made available for fiscal year 2025: Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading in this Act, the following amounts shall be for the following purposes in equal amounts for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2025, unless stated otherwise—

(1) \$250,000,000 shall be for grants for the community mental health services block grant program under subpart I of part B of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act;

(2) \$40,000,000 shall be for National Child Traumatic Stress Network;

(3) \$240,000,000 shall be for activities and services under Project AWARE, of which no less than \$28,000,000 shall be for activities described in section 7134 of Public Law 115–271;

(4) \$120,000,000 shall be for Mental Health Awareness Training; and

(5) \$150,000,000 shall be for the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline for fiscal year 2022.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES EMERGENCY FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for “Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund”, \$190,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2026: Provided, That \$82,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2022, shall be made available for fiscal year 2022, \$32,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023, shall be made available for fiscal year 2023, \$32,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2024, shall be made available for fiscal year 2024, \$32,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2025, shall be made available for fiscal year 2025, and \$12,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2026, shall be made available for fiscal year 2026: Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading in this Act, the following amounts shall be for the following purposes in equal amounts for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026, unless stated otherwise—

(1) \$60,000,000 shall be for primary care training and enhancement under section 747 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 293k) to provide mental and behavioral health care training as part of the training of pediatricians and other primary care clinicians who plan to provide care for pediatric populations and other vulnerable populations, such as victims of abuse or trauma, and individuals with mental health or substance use disorders: Provided further, That section 747(c)(2) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 293k(c)(2)) shall not apply to funding made available in this paragraph: Provided further, That such funds shall be transferred to “Health Resources and Services Administration—Health Workforce”;

(2) \$80,000,000 shall be for pediatric mental health care access under section 330M of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c-19), in equal amounts for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2025: Provided further, That such funds shall be transferred to "Health Resources and Services Administration—Maternal and Child Health"; and

(3) \$50,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for carrying out subsection (b) of section 11003 of division A of this Act for fiscal year 2022: Provided further, That such funds shall be transferred to "Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services—Grants to States for Medicaid".

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "School Improvement Programs", \$1,050,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2025, for carrying out subpart 1 of part A of title IV and part B of title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education of 1965 (referred to in this Act as "ESEA"), in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes: Provided, That \$50,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2023, shall be for carrying out part B of title IV of the ESEA: Provided further, That the Secretary shall increase support for the implementation of evidence-based practices intended to increase attendance and engagement of students in the middle grades and high school in community learning centers using funds in the preceding proviso: Provided further, That \$1,000,000,000 shall be for activities under section 4108 of the ESEA and, notwithstanding section 4105 of such Act, States shall make awards on a competitive basis to high-need local educational agencies as determined by the State.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

For an additional amount for "Safe Schools and Citizenship Education", \$1,000,000,000, to remain available through December 31, 2026: Provided, That \$200,000,000, to remain available until March 31, 2023, shall be made available for fiscal year 2022, \$200,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2023, shall be made available for fiscal year 2023, \$200,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2024, shall be made available for fiscal year 2024, \$200,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2025, shall be made available for fiscal year 2025, and \$200,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2026, shall be made available for fiscal year 2026: Provided further, That not more than two percent of each of such amounts may be used for program administration, technical assistance, data collection, and dissemination of best practices: Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading in this Act, the following amounts shall be available for the following purposes in equal amounts for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026—

(1) \$500,000,000 shall be for carrying out School Based Mental Health Services Grants, in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes; and

(2) \$500,000,000 shall be for carrying out Mental Health Services Professional Demonstration Grants, in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 22001. None of the funds made available by this title may be transferred in this or any future fiscal year pursuant to the authority in section 205 or section 302 of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2022 (division H of Public Law 117-103), or any successor provision in a subsequently enacted appropriations Act, or section 241(a) of the Public Health Service Act.

SEC. 22002. Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretaries of Health and Human Services and Education shall each provide a detailed spend plan of an-

ticipated uses of funds made available to their respective Departments in this title, including estimated personnel and administrative costs, to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: Provided, That such plans shall be updated and submitted to such Committees every 60 days until all funds are expended: Provided further, That the spend plans shall be accompanied by a listing of each contract obligation incurred that exceeds \$5,000,000 which has not previously been reported, including the amount of each such obligation: Provided further, That the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate shall be briefed on obligations quarterly until all funds are expended.

SEC. 22003. Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretaries of Health and Human Services and Education shall each provide biweekly obligation reports for funds made available to their respective Departments in this title, including anticipated uses of funds made available in this title, to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: Provided, That such reports shall be updated and submitted biweekly to the Committees until all funds are expended.

TITLE III

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS DIVISION

SEC. 23001. Each amount appropriated or made available by this division is in addition to amounts otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year involved.

SEC. 23002. No part of any appropriation contained in this division shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 23003. Unless otherwise provided for by this division, the additional amounts appropriated by this division to appropriations accounts shall be available under the authorities and conditions applicable to such appropriations accounts for fiscal year 2022.

SEC. 23004. Each amount provided by this division is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4001(a)(1) and section 4001(b) of S. Con. Res. 14 (117th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2022.

SEC. 23005. (a) STATUTORY PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of each division of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of each division of this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress).

(c) CLASSIFICATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.—Notwithstanding Rule 3 of the Budget Scorekeeping Guidelines set forth in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying Conference Report 105-217 and section 250(c)(7) and (c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the budgetary effects of this division shall be estimated for purposes of section 251 of such Act and as appropriations for discretionary accounts for purposes of the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 4001 of S. Con. Res. 14 (117th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2022.

This division may be cited as the "Bipartisan Safer Communities Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2022".

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to make our communities safer."

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NADLER moves that the House concur in the Senate amendments to the House amendment to S. 2938.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1204, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their designees.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on S. 2938.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not comment on the decision of the Supreme Court, just minutes ago, to revoke the constitutional right to abortion, a right that millions of Americans have relied upon for half a century.

Worse, Justice Thomas has indicated that this is merely the beginning of a radical, rightwing effort to roll back other rights, including the right to contraception, the right to marry whomever we choose, and the fundamental right to privacy.

We should observe that the same Justices telling us today that questions about reproductive rights must be left to the States, told us just yesterday that the States cannot be trusted to regulate modern firearms, weapons that were never dreamed of by the Framers of the Second Amendment. History will prove these activists wrong on both counts.

But today, Mr. Speaker, we take a historic first step toward ending the epidemic of gun violence in this Nation, the only developed Nation with this problem.

We come to this moment after the tragic loss of so many innocent lives: 10 African Americans in Buffalo, targeted because of their race; 19 young students and 2 teachers in Uvalde, just a few days short of their summer vacations; scores more lost in other mass shootings too numerous to mention; and over 100 more Americans killed every day in gun violence that never makes the headlines.

No piece of legislation can ever bring these lives back. No legislation can make their families or their communities whole. But we can act to keep others from facing the same trauma they have endured.

A few weeks ago, I was proud to bring forth the Protecting Our Kids Act,

which took a bipartisan and comprehensive approach to ending gun violence. I am pleased that the Senate incorporated portions of that bill into their own legislation.

I wish there was more. I wish we could say we were doing everything we could to prevent another parent from losing their child to gun violence, but I am proud to be making an important start today.

This cannot be the last step, but we also cannot let another day go by without taking action to make our communities safer and to keep even one more family whole.

Recently, I have turned to a particular teaching in the Talmud:

Whoever takes one life, it is as if he kills the entire world; and whoever saves one life, it is as if he saves the entire world.

This legislation includes provisions that will save many lives. Like the Protecting Our Kids Act, it includes funding to implement extreme risk protection laws and the prohibition on straw purchasing. It also strengthens background checks for those under 21, makes more sellers responsible for conducting background checks, takes steps to address the boyfriend loophole, and provides significant funding for programs that will make our communities safer.

Today, we will send legislation to the President's desk, for the first time in decades, that will make progress toward ending the scourge of gun violence.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1130

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me first say, God bless the United States Supreme Court. And God bless President Trump for the people he selected for our highest court. Today's decision is a win for the Constitution and a win for the sanctity of human life. June 24, 2022, a date that will be remembered as a win for the sacredness of human life.

Now this bill. Mr. Speaker, the rights spelled out in the First Amendment and protected by the Second Amendment are why the United States is different than every other country. It is why we are special. It is why we are the greatest Nation in history.

For 18 months, the Democrats have attacked our First Amendment liberties. Today, they are coming after our Second Amendment liberties. And who knows what it will be tomorrow. I can only imagine.

My guess is, in light of the decision yesterday from Justice Thomas, the decision today from the Court, my guess is they are going to look to pack the Court. The Democrat chair of the Committee on the Judiciary has already introduced legislation to pack the Court.

It might be amnesty for the 2 million illegal immigrants who have come into

our country in the Biden administration. They told us they want to end the electoral college and the filibuster—and who knows what it will be tomorrow. But today, they are coming after law-abiding American citizens' Second Amendment liberties.

Understand what this legislation does. This legislation tells States: Someone who doesn't like you can report you to law enforcement or to a judge. There will be a hearing, a hearing where you can't be at, your lawyer can't be at, you can't confront your accuser. You didn't commit any crime, but they can take your property. They can take your guns. They can take away your Second Amendment rights. And then you have to petition to have a subsequent hearing where you get them back. That is what this legislation does.

And understand this, and this is so important. This is not being done in a vacuum. Understand what we have seen from the left and how they have weaponized a government against their political enemies.

Mr. Speaker, 12 years ago, it was the IRS targeting conservatives.

Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago, it was the FBI spying on President Trump's campaign.

More recently, it was the Department of Justice using counterterrorism measures against moms and dads.

Just a few weeks ago, the Department of Homeland Security set up the Disinformation Governance Board; going to chill everyone's speech. Today, they are coming after your Second Amendment liberties.

Here is the good news: Yesterday, the Supreme Court got it right. They got it right when it came to the Second Amendment. We should celebrate that. I hope that this bill doesn't pass. It seems like it is going to, but I hope it doesn't.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his extraordinary leadership in bringing this very important legislation to the floor. I commend the chairman, as well as Mr. MIKE THOMPSON, the chair of our Gun Violence Prevention Task Force, and so many others who have participated in so many elements of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan Safer Communities Act, a strong step forward to combat America's epidemic of gun violence and to protect our precious children.

As lawmakers, we share a sacred responsibility to keep our kids safe from harm. But according to new data from the CDC, guns are the number one killer of children in America; more than car accidents or cancer. Our hearts remain shattered by the rampage at Robb Elementary School in Uvalde, as

they do from the massacre at Sandy Hook, and countless other communities across the Nation.

Indeed, we know these schools could have been in any one of our districts—and have been in some, those families could have been any one of our neighbors—and have been, and those children could have been our own.

All of us who have met with survivors in the wake of the tragedies have heard their message loud and clear. We must do something.

Today, in their honor, we heed their powerful cry, sending a major gun violence prevention legislation to President Biden's desk for signature. We send it to the President for his signature, with gratitude for his leadership on this important issue. He was the author of the Brady Law in 1994 and has been a champion ever since.

This legislation, the bipartisan Safer Communities Act, includes several strong steps to save lives not only from horrific mass shootings, but also from the daily massacre of gun crime, suicide, and tragic accidents.

Included in this package are two major provisions which we have championed here in the House:

First, this bill includes significant investments to help States establish Extreme Risk Protection Order Laws, otherwise known as red flag laws.

Thanks to the leadership of Representative LUCY MCBATH, who has been our inspirational leader on this subject in our caucus and this Congress, and SALUD CARBAJAL, these provisions will keep deadly weapons away from those who pose a threat to themselves and to others.

Secondly, this bill takes strong action to combat straw purchases, a cause Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY spearheaded in our Chamber. Although we hear about the notorious mass murders every day on our streets and in our country, murders take place. Doing so will make it illegal to buy guns on behalf of those who cannot legally purchase.

If I can pass the test, I buy the gun. And then I sell it to you because you can't pass the test.

Straw purchase. Very dangerous. This bill addresses that. That is a giant step.

This package also includes additional initiatives that will help reduce the danger of gun violence across our country. We are moving toward closing the boyfriend loophole: a victory to help protect survivors of domestic violence and to stop known abusers from acquiring a gun. This has long been a priority.

We are strengthening background checks for potential buyers under 21, which would have applied to the 18-year-old gunman at Uvalde. And we are making enormous investments in mental health programs, school safety programs, and community-based violence prevention initiatives.

I mention all these, Mr. Speaker, because, of course, I have to say that this

bill doesn't do everything we would like to do. We need to do more on background checks. There is some other language that we would like to do in terms of background checks not only on guns, but perhaps on high-capacity armament.

I say to my colleagues, as I frequently do—but it applies here now more than ever: Let us not judge this legislation for what is not in it but respect it for what it does. And what it does is save lives. And we are very, very proud of that.

Again, I thank Chairman NADLER and Gun Violence Protection Task Force chairman, MIKE THOMPSON, for their determined leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor. This package represents the most significant action to prevent gun violence in nearly three decades and is a necessary step to honor our solemn duty as lawmakers to protect and defend the American people.

Importantly, the bipartisan Safer Communities Act has earned strong support from gun owners, gun survivors, and law enforcement alike.

Gun Owners for Responsible Ownership endorse our bill saying: "We write today as responsible gun owners; but above all else, we are proud parents and grandparents of toddlers, students, and young teachers. We want them to be safe."

Everytown for Gun Safety wrote that this "commonsense legislation addresses every form of gun violence."

And the Fraternal Order of Police and the International Association of Chiefs of Police applauded our bipartisan agreement, calling it a giant step forward and one that will save lives. I repeat: A giant step forward and one that will save lives. The statements are from the Fraternal Order of Police and the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

Indeed, keeping our children safe is a unifying issue for our country, and it must be a unifying issue in this Congress.

Yesterday, our Nation watched in horror as a radical partisan supermajority of the Supreme Court ruled to flood America's streets with even more deadly weapons.

It is unconscionable that as America reaches a fever pitch of gun violence, the Court has chosen to create a new right to bring guns into public spaces, while hindering the ability of States to stop the bloodshed. In doing so, the GOP supermajority, Trump-McConnell Court, is implicitly endorsing the tragedy of mass shootings and daily gun deaths plaguing our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, with this bipartisan package, we take the first steps to fight back on behalf of the American people who desperately want new measures to keep communities safe in the high numbers in the polling.

Our Democratic House majority has again and again passed landmark legislation that would combat the scourge of gun violence, and we will never give up in our fight to save lives

Mr. Speaker, our fight to prevent gun violence is of, by, and for the children.

Of the children, because they are suffering. It is heartbreaking that in America more children die from guns than any other cause.

By the children, because they are leading. We see the children marching in the streets, testifying before Congress, demanding action.

And always for the children, building a future where every child can reach his or her fulfillment, free from the fear of gun violence.

To the Members who lack the courage to join in this work—to those who lack the courage to join in this work—I say your political survival is insignificant compared to the survival of our children. Today, we will prevail for the children.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a strong bipartisan "aye" vote for this lifesaving legislation.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what saves lives. The decision we got from the Supreme Court today saves lives. This bill takes rights away from law-abiding citizens, their Second Amendment liberties. That is the key distinction.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, Speaker PELOSI just lectured us. She said guns are the number one killer of children in America.

That is not true. Abortion violence is the number one killer of children in America, until today. There is no right to abortion in the Constitution. And, thankfully, the Supreme Court finally said that decisively. Thanks be to God.

There is a right, however, a crystal-clear right in the Constitution to keep and bear arms. But here we are today. Congress is moving full steam ahead to restrict the right to self-defense for law-abiding gun owners and the right to due process for all Americans.

This legislation is the wrong approach, and we ought to oppose it.

In our Judiciary markup several days ago, some of our Democrat colleagues here on the floor today openly said they don't care about the Constitution. They don't care about its protections. They want to overlook that. This bill does that. It is the perfect example of Members of Congress simply ignoring the Constitution.

President Biden and his administration are already disobeying laws that we have on the books to revoke firearm dealer licenses over simple clerical errors. This legislation is going to make that worse. This is not going to help anything. It is going to lead to more errors, more false flags, more backlogs in the NICS system. There is nothing in this bill to fix that. There is nothing in this bill to increase school safety.

Mr. Speaker, we want real solutions. We think that we ought to harden the schools; real, physical improvements to help protect children, but that is not here. They didn't have time for that.

Two weeks ago, I had a very moving conversation with Pastor YJ Jimenez. He is a pastor on the ground ministering to the people of the Uvalde community who have suffered such an unspeakable loss. He said something that was really clear, and I think it is echoed throughout America. People paid a lot of attention to it.

He said, You know what, we need to address the root causes of all this bloodshed. He said America's problem is not guns. America's problem is a heart problem. And he is exactly right.

Today we are seeing the results of decades of decline in the secularization of American society and the open assault on our institutions: family, religion, morality, the breakdown of law and order.

We see the results of all this on young people—in clinical settings, in schools, and everywhere else.

We want to do things that matter.

It is not more gun control.

It is not more Federal laws.

It is not more intrusive government.

We need to address the root causes.

□ 1145

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I stand here in the name of Mr. Garza, whose daughter in Uvalde bled out, Buffalo, Tulsa, Parkland, Santa Fe, and Sandy Hook. I stand here with the recognition of my chairman, Mr. NADLER, and the years and decades—mine, over two decades—of fighting for gun laws.

As I hold up the number of gun laws that I introduced over 27 years—pages and pages—I can say to the Senate that in this bill, the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, they have built on our legislation.

My bill, the Mental Health Access and Gun Violence Prevention Act, which will increase access to mental health treatment, is in this bill. The Violence Against Women Act, the boyfriend loophole, is in this bill. The Protecting Our Kids Act and the issues dealing with raising the age, bump stocks, and ghost guns are yet to be done, but we can stand on this because it was bipartisan.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a list of gun violence prevention legislation.

CONGRESSWOMAN SHEILA JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION LEGISLATION

117TH CONGRESS

H.R. 127—Sabika Sheikh Firearm Licensing and Registration Act

H.R. 2585, "Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Reauthorization and the Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act"

H.R. 121—Grin Violence Reduction Resources Act of 2021

H.R. 125, Gun Safety: Not Sorry Act of 2021

H.R. 130, Kimberly Vaughan Firearm Safe Storage Act

H.R. 135, Accidental Firearms Transfers Reporting Act of 2021

H.R. 137, Mental Health Access and Gun Violence Prevention Act of 2021

H.R. 138, David Ray Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 2021

116TH CONGRESS

H.R. 49, Santa Fe High School Victims Act
H.R. 4080, Kimberly Vaughan Firearm Safe Storage Act

H.R. 4081, Sabika Sheikh Firearm Licensing and Registration Act

H.R. 4082, Accidental Firearms Transfers Reporting Act of 2019

115TH CONGRESS

H.R. 57, Accidental Firearms Transfers Reporting Act of 2017

H.R. 62, Gun Violence Reduction Resources Act of 2017

H.R. 1982, Mental Health Access and Gun Violence Prevention Act of 2017

H.R. 1983, David Ray Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 2017

H.R. 4268, Gun Safety: Not Sorry Act of 2017

H.R. 5088, No More Atrocities with Guns Act or the No MAGA Act

H.R. 7016, Protect Lives and Stop the Imminent Chaos Act of 2019—the PLASTIC Act

114TH CONGRESS

H.R. 4315—Mental Health Access and Gun Violence Prevention Act

H.R. 4316—Gun Violence Reduction Resources Act

H.R. 47—Gun Storage and Safety Devices for All Firearms Act

H.R. 3125—Accidental Firearms Transfers Reporting Act

H.R. 5470—Stopping Mass Killings by Violent Terrorists Act

H. Amdt. 48 to H.R. 5 Student Success Act

H.R. 68—Tiffany Joslyn Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Program Reauthorization Act of 2016

113TH CONGRESS

H.R. 65, Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act of 2013

H.R. 2665, To ensure secure gun storage and gun safety devices

H.R. 2585—Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Reauthorization and the Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act of 2013

112TH CONGRESS

H.R. 4315, Mental Health Access and Gun Violence Prevention Act of 2016

H.R. 4316, Gun Violence Reduction Resources Act of 2016

H.R. 65, Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act of 2013

H.R. 2665, To ensure secure gun storage and gun safety devices.

H.R. 227—Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act of 2011

H.R. 83—Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act of 2011

H.R. 5770—Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Reauthorization and the Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act

H.R. 6019—Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Reauthorization and the Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act of 2012

111TH CONGRESS

H.R. 257—Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act of 2009

H.R. 6542—Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act of 2010

110TH CONGRESS

H.R. 256—Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act of 2007

109TH CONGRESS

H.R. 246—Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act of 2005

108TH CONGRESS

H.R. 76—Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act of 2003

107TH CONGRESS

H.R. 70—Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act of 2001

H. Amdt. 187—107th Congress

106TH CONGRESS

H.R. 3987—Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act of 2000

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, people are dying every day, and it is obvious that through the legislation—The New York Times said here are the shootings, pages and pages, that could have been stopped by stricter gun laws.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this article has the mass shootings where stricter gun laws might have made a difference.

We understand that this legislation is only the concrete beginning. My friends are going to attack that, but the American people are 70 percent for banning various weapons that are assault weapons. They are 70 percent and more for extreme risk protection. They are 70 percent and more for understanding that we need an extended time for purchase of these guns. And, yes, they are supporters of the Kimberly Vaughn Safe Storage Act, which is a storage bill that says that we need to get people to prevent suicide and to store their guns.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2938, the “Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.”

America is experiencing a crisis of gun violence.

In America, gun violence threatens our sense of safety and security everywhere we go: where we shop for groceries; where we worship with our families; and where we enjoy movies, dancing, outdoor festivals, and concerts with friends.

I and many other members of Congress have introduced commonsense gun safety legislation to make communities safer—over and over, year after year, Congress after Congress. Until now, we have been unable to pass any meaningful legislation.

After more than twenty years of drafting and repeatedly introducing gun safety legislation, like my bill, the Mental Health Access and Gun Violence Prevention Act to increase access to mental health treatment and promote reporting of mental health information to the background check system, I am encouraged by the steps we are taking today but wish we did not have to lose so many lives to reach this point.

For years, I fought to close the boyfriend loophole—most recently in the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization of 2021, which passed the House last year.

Finally, through the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, we will ensure abusive dating partners convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence offenses are prohibited from purchasing or possessing firearms for at least five years.

Two weeks ago, this body proved to the American people that a compromise could be reached on sensible gun safety measures when we passed the “Protecting Our Kids Act.” That legislation, which I introduced along

with Chairman JERRY NADLER and Representative MIKE THOMPSON, encompassed decades of our hard work and proved to be the catalyst for the bill we are considering today.

Like the Protecting Our Kids Act, this bill would establish new federal offenses that specifically prohibit gun trafficking and straw purchasing to thwart guns moving through the iron pipeline, keeping them off the street and out of the hands of criminals.

While our bill would have raised the age at which a person could purchase a semiautomatic rifle from 18 to 21—a concept I proposed in my No More Atrocities with Guns Act of 2018—this bill would enhance the background check process and investigative period for purchases of rifles by anyone under the age of 21 and further strengthen the background check process by clarifying who is engaged in the business of selling firearms and, as a result, is required to run background checks.

We also passed the Federal Extreme Risk Protection Order Act of 2021 recently that would give loved ones the ability to seek an extreme risk protection order before our federal court when an individual presents a serious threat to themselves or others by use of a firearm and provide funding to enhance, promote, and implement similar laws at the state-level, which Safer Communities will do.

With the passage of this bill, we make a significant step forward in the fight to end gun violence. But we must keep working to find reasonable solutions to other problems that contribute to gun violence in this country that are not addressed in this bill.

We must ban deadly bump stocks, ghost guns, and high-capacity magazines as we endeavored to do in the Protecting Our Kids Act. We must ban assault weapons.

We must institute a seven-day waiting period for purchases of the deadliest of instrumentalities such as silencers and body armor, which I have pressed for in my own bill, the Gun Safety: Not Sorry Act of 2017 and 2021, and assault weapons if we do not ban them.

We must pass legislation that encourages safe firearm storage practices, like my bill the Kimberly Vaughn Firearm Safe Storage Act that was included in the Protecting Our Kids Act to expand the requirement that safe storage devices be made available at the point of sale, which will train new gun owners on the value of safe storage and remind seasoned gun owners that safe storage goes hand-in-hand with responsible gun ownership.

23 years after Columbine when I first began introducing gun safety legislation, and hundreds of thousands of gun deaths later, we continue to mourn the unnecessary loss of life. Enough is enough.

While this bill may not solve all the problems that contribute to the epidemic of gun violence, we must pass it without delay. Far too many lives have been lost for us to wait any longer.

I support this meaningful, bipartisan legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same. Let us save lives and protect the children of America—together.

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act would inject \$4.5 billion in critical funding into various state agencies and programs through the Department of Justice, Department of Health and Human Services, and Department of Education to:

Expand community mental health services for children and families, and fund school-based mental health services and supports;

Implement evidence-based school violence prevention efforts; and

Encourage and support evidence-based, community violence intervention programs and crisis intervention services, including the implementation of vital Red Flag Laws—which have been proven to reduce the firearm suicide rates in states that have already enacted such laws.

In America, gun violence is the leading cause of death among children. In America, an average of 70 women are shot and killed by an intimate partner every month. In America, mass shootings occur increasingly each year—and every day, 316 people on average are shot. In America, 45,979 deaths were by suicide in 2020—more than half of those deaths were by firearm.

Each day parents send their children off to school, from elementary age to college, praying now more than ever that they will return to them safe and sound.

19 elementary school-aged children and two teachers in Uvalde, Texas; 10 people going about their daily lives at a market in Buffalo, New York, all killed by 18-year-olds wielding AR-15-style weapons of war. And 4 people murdered at a hospital in Tulsa, Oklahoma with another assault weapon purchased only hours earlier.

In my home state of Texas, the El Paso Walmart shooting—22 dead; Sutherland Springs—26 dead; Santa Fe High School—10 dead; Fort Hood in 2009—13 dead; and the Dallas shooting of police—5 officers dead and nine others injured.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank God for the decision that stops the heinous practice that has taken more than 60 million lives in this country over the last 50 years. I thank God that those voices that have been lost, we will not see that anymore. I hope and pray that that is the case. I thank them for that.

There is no right to take that life, but there is a right to defend yourself. We have a God-given, constitutionally protected right to protect ourselves, and the Supreme Court reaffirmed that yesterday.

This bill infringes on the constitutionally protected rights of law-abiding Americans, and it provides funding for States to infringe on Americans' Second Amendment rights and violate their due process rights.

It treats 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old Americans as second-class citizens. The Ninth Circuit recently held that the Second Amendment applies to 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old Americans just like it does to Americans over the age of 21.

This bill criminalizes routine gun transactions between law-abiding Americans.

Justice Alito, in his concurrence, highlighted the flawed logic used by the supporters of this bill. Alito said: "Does the dissent think that laws like New York's prevent or deter such atrocities? Will a person bent on carrying out a mass shooting be stopped if he knows that it is illegal to carry a handgun outside the home? And how does the dissent account for the fact

that one of the mass shootings near the top of its list took place in Buffalo? The New York law at issue in this case obviously did not stop that perpetrator."

The essence of this is gun controls do not stop criminals because criminals have no regard for the law. That is the definition of a criminal.

This bill will restrict law-abiding Americans' ability to purchase firearms and protect themselves and their families. It violates a basic God-given right.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill.

My State of California has several provisions in law that are included in this bill, but it doesn't work as a patchwork because individuals can cross State lines and endanger people.

Everything in this bill is consistent with the Second Amendment. That is why it got such bipartisan support in the Senate.

In the last 3 years alone, my district has had two cities added to the long list of communities that have experienced mass shootings.

America doesn't have to be the only country in the world where mass shootings are a near-daily occurrence. There is broad support in the country for reform that will prevent this epidemic of gun violence.

This bill doesn't do everything that I think should happen, but it does something. It will make people safer. I strongly urge its support.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, instead of treating law-abiding citizens as if they were criminals, maybe we should start treating criminals as if they were criminals. Stop the plea bargains, put gun predators behind bars until they are old and gray, and execute the murderers.

Those measures worked until a generation of soft-on-crime judges, woke district attorneys, and politically correct police commissioners made a mockery of our laws.

If someone is dangerously mentally ill, then, of course, they should not have access to firearms. They shouldn't have access to any kind of weapons. We once confined them so we could treat them and prevent them from doing harm during the course of their illness. We had a commitment process that respected due process. They could come before a judge to challenge the findings in open court, submit evidence on their behalf, and face their accuser, but not under the red flag laws this bill promotes.

An anonymous accuser can trigger a secret proceeding against you that you don't even know is happening until the

police bang on your door in the dead of night, ransack your house, and strip you of your right of self-defense. The burden then falls on you to try to restore it.

This bill also targets young adults for special restrictions. We trust them to vote, to start families, to enter into legally binding agreements, but we don't trust them with firearms because of what some criminal or madman their age did?

Just laws hold people accountable for their own actions; unjust laws hold them accountable for other people's actions. This is an unjust law.

These atrocities will go on until we get the criminals and madmen off our streets. How many more tragedies do we need to go through before the Congress understands this self-evident truth?

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, for years, the gun violence epidemic in our country has forced us to cope with immeasurable grief and loss.

Throughout America, many communities have begun to erect memorials to remember those they have lost through gun violence. These monuments are not much different than those right outside The National Mall that honor Americans killed in war.

Just last week, people in San Bernardino, California, unveiled the Curtain of Courage made of steel and bronze to pay tribute to the 16 people who were murdered at a mass shooting there in 2015.

In Newtown, Connecticut, a planned memorial will feature a spiral of granite inscribed with the names of 20 children and 6 teachers killed at Sandy Hook Elementary in 2012.

Memorials are being built or planned, as well, to honor those who died in shootings in Charleston, Orlando, Las Vegas, El Paso, Buffalo, Uvalde, and many others.

The best way to honor those we have lost to gun violence, however, is not with bronze, steel, or granite. Rather, it is with meaningful action to prevent others from suffering the same fate.

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, which was overwhelmingly passed by the United States Senate, and which I am pleased to bring to the floor today, is a step in the right direction to take action.

This legislation includes measures that will reduce the threat of gun violence and save lives across the country. It will help implement red flag laws that empower law enforcement officers to keep guns out of the hands of people at risk of using them to harm themselves or others. Closing the so-called boyfriend loophole in this bill will prevent people convicted of domestic abuse in a dating relationship from possessing deadly firearms. If they have displayed violence, they ought to be prohibited from getting weapons

that will make mass violence more probable and possible. It will also require more thorough background checks for Americans under the age of 21 who seek to purchase a gun.

We passed expanded background checks through this House, and 85 percent of the American people say they are for that—and that is the minimum—but no action has been taken in the United States Senate. They have taken some action, and some action is better than no action.

Additionally, this legislation includes \$250 million in funding for community-based violence prevention programs.

Do we not want to see community violence diminished?

It will also crack down on those who make straw purchases, purchases of guns that otherwise, under the existing system, could not be purchased by the ultimate user of those guns.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Senator MURPHY, Judiciary Committee Chairman JERRY NADLER, Representative LUCY MCBATH, Representative ROBIN KELLY, Chairman MIKE THOMPSON of the Gun Violence Prevention Task Force, and those Republicans who said that “NRA” does not stand for “no Republican action.” They took action. They stood up, even in the face of boos from their own party.

This legislation, as I said, is a step forward. That is how we make progress in America, a step at a time.

None of us have had the opportunity ever to vote on a perfect bill in this House. We vote on good bills that we feel will move our country forward. This is that kind of bill, a step forward but not enough.

Many of us feel that we need to do more. We need to do comprehensive background checks. We need to close the Charleston loophole. We sent those bills to the Senate.

We can and must do more.

Yesterday, the Supreme Court issued a ruling that will weaken common-sense gun safety laws all over the country. Yes, we can return to the O.K. Corral and everybody having a six-shooter on their hip. Anybody who thinks that would make us a safer, more civil community I think is sadly mistaken. That fact ought to disturb all of us very deeply.

The Court’s decision to make it even easier for bad actors to carry dangerous concealed guns without restrictions should serve as a reminder that we need to take additional active steps to protect our communities and our kids, actions that are supported by the overwhelming majority of the American people.

If we fail to do that, if we allow this legislation to be the end instead of the beginning, parents will continue to receive that dreaded, unfathomable call that they will never see their children again, and new monuments honoring victims will continue to pop up in communities across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my House colleagues, Republicans and Democrats,

conservatives and liberals, we don’t need additional memorials. We need action, and we need new laws.

If we can follow today’s legislation with action on comprehensive background checks and further gun safety measures, however, future generations—perhaps it is not guaranteed, but it is certainly worth the effort to reduce the gun violence and to reduce the need for memorials.

□ 1200

If we do not, then those who come after will wonder why their forebears allowed such violence to be perpetrated uniquely in America.

Mr. Speaker, you don’t find this in other countries—democratic countries and free countries—that protect individual rights.

Mr. Speaker, today, in just a few minutes, let us begin to end the cycle of tragedy and inaction. Let us pass this bill and say: No more.

Let us pass it and then do more. Vote “yes.”

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

Today, the United States Supreme Court stood up in defense of the Constitution in recognizing that it is the people—the people—who should be able to come together and make decisions about life and to be able to stand up and protect the God-given right to life.

Here today on the floor of this body, the people’s House—the so-called people’s House—is taking up legislation that is in direct conflict with the United States Constitution, our Bill of Rights, and the right to keep and bear arms. It is purposeful.

Do you know what?

When our colleagues say things like what the President said, that whether it is a 9-millimeter pistol or a rifle, I am going to continue to push to eliminate the sale of those things. When it is Representative MONDAIRE JONES saying that semi-automatic weapons would qualify as assault weapons and these things should be banned. Or when the Democrats tweeted that semi-automatic rifles are weapons of war, then we should believe you.

We should believe you that you want to take those weapons. That is what you are saying. That is what my colleagues are saying.

Here is the thing: my colleagues say, oh, don’t worry, this is just money for mental health.

Do you know what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and some academics say?

They have put out stories talking about how supposedly conservatives are suffering from mental health issues and that Republicans have become the cult of the mentally ill.

“Is political conservatism a mild form of insanity?” writes Psychology Today.

You get article after article.

What do you think you want to do with the mental health money? What do you think you want to do?

You want to come after our ability to defend ourselves against the very tyranny you want to undermine by taking away the weapons we can use to defend ourselves against that tyranny. That is the purpose.

My colleagues on this side of the aisle—the handful who are going along with it—should be ashamed of themselves because right now, today, we have a duty to stand up here and defend our right to defend ourselves against the very tyranny that you ignore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, when the previous speaker refers to using guns to protect tyranny, he is talking—whether he realizes it or not—about stopping tyranny by turning those weapons against American troops.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), who is the chairman of the Gun Violence Task Force.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation, the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.

While the tragic loss of 19 precious children and 2 teachers in Uvalde, Texas, and the disgusting racially motivated slaughter in Buffalo, New York, captured the Nation’s attention, we know that gun violence survivors and their allies across our country have been working every day to prevent the gun violence that kills 30 people every day and over 100 when you factor in accidents and suicides.

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act passes three important tests. It is legal, it has the votes, and it saves lives. This bill saves lives by targeting convicted domestic abusers and felons coercing someone to illegally purchase a gun for them. This bill saves lives by strengthening school safety and mental health resources.

This bill and the millions of gun violence victims and gun violence survivors deserve a “yes” vote today from every Member in this Chamber. A majority of Americans and responsible gun owners know this bill is important.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone to vote “yes.”

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, on February 14, 2018, my community hit the depths of despair when 17 innocent people were slaughtered at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School. The families from Stoneman Douglas who lost loved ones have committed themselves in so many ways since to help get us to this moment. For them, the families of Uvalde, Buffalo, Newtown,

and so many families that we all have had the opportunity to get to know, this day is about them.

But I finish with this: on the day after Parkland, there was a rally in the park near the school. The field was covered with high school kids who came to express themselves. One of them came up to me, still with a look of shock in her eyes. She grabbed my arm, and she said: Congressman, my best friend bled out on me. You have to do something.

Today, we do.

Mr. Speaker, vote “yes” to support this legislation.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD).

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, what a great day for the babies and—as the Speaker described it—the Trump-McConnell Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the House amendment to S. 2938. This bill could have had strong bipartisan support if it had focused solely on mental health and school safety. The Supreme Court made it clear yesterday that the Second Amendment includes the right to carry a gun for self-defense purposes outside the home.

This bill flies in the face of that ruling. Specifically, the bill fails to define what constitutes a willful violation that would warrant a revocation of a Federal firearm license. This is especially important given the Department of Justice’s zero tolerance policy and the over 500 percent increase in license revocation proceedings that have occurred under this administration.

Current extreme risk protective orders that exist in 19 States do not come close to providing adequate due process protections. We cannot support the use of taxpayer funds to implement more such unconstitutional laws without specific and ironclad assurances that due process rights will be protected.

In the wake of the tragic shooting at Stoneman Douglas High School in February 2018, I worked with my colleagues in the Wisconsin legislature to protect against school shootings. We worked to pass Act 143 which appropriated \$100 million in school safety grants. That is where this bill should be going.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to focus on bipartisan solutions that will not infringe on our constitutional rights.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LIEU), who is a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. LIEU. Mr. Speaker, Democrats and Republicans are not the same. While Democrats are working to pass this gun safety legislation for the people, Republicans have whipped their Members to oppose it.

Democrats and Republicans are not the same. With the Supreme Court handing down radical decisions, you have extreme MAGA Republicans working to eliminate gun safety laws,

while Democrats are working to expand gun safety laws.

You have extreme MAGA Republicans calling for a nationwide criminal abortion ban while Democrats are working to preserve *Roe v. Wade*.

Democrats and Republicans are not the same. I urge all Americans to remember that this November.

Mr. JORDAN. We sure aren’t the same, Mr. Speaker. We actually think you should protect the sanctity of human life, and we so appreciate the decision from the Court today. We don’t think you should take away rights from law-abiding American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY).

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, America does not have a gun problem. America has a crime problem.

Mr. Speaker, law-abiding Americans do not want more laws chipping away at the Second Amendment. They do not want to see their right to bear arms eliminated on the installment plan. They want prosecutors to prosecute. They want the police to police. They want dangerous criminals off the streets and behind bars.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA), who is a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, in Uvalde, Texas, children were killed in an elementary school. This is one of 128—128—mass shootings in America over the last 40 years.

It is time to act. This is not perfect legislation. But if we can save one, two, three or more lives, then it is our responsibility to pass this legislation. Our communities are depending on us.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman who has done so much on this issue for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 2938, the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.

More than 15 years ago, I was chairman of Fairfax County when the Virginia Tech tragedy occurred. We buried six young people in my community that week—six. I am still in touch with those families, and the emptiness in their souls will never go away.

Today, we have an opportunity to choose: will we protect our children, or will we continue to persist in an abstract ideological commitment to an absolute reading of the Second Amendment which is false, and a false reading of the Constitution.

We can do something finally. America demands we do something. We need to disenthrall ourselves from the gun mythology and do the right thing: protecting our communities and our children.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW).

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, today I rise as a father, a combat veteran, a gun owner, and the Representative of a community devastated by gun violence.

My constituents are family and friends of those who were killed at Columbine, at the Aurora Theater, at STEM School Highlands Ranch, and at the Boulder King Soopers. As a community, we consoled each other after each one of these terrible shootings, and we demanded commonsense reform, but for too long our Nation’s leaders refused to act.

When I came to Congress I promised my constituents that I would fight to protect our community from gun violence.

Today, I am proud to vote for the first comprehensive gun violence package in 30 years. This bill is a first step. It doesn’t have everything we would hope for, but it is a step in the right direction.

Today’s success belongs to every Coloradan who turned their hurt into action. This long overdue progress is theirs.

Mr. Speaker, I plead with my colleagues for a “yes” vote.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Each side has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act. It is past time that Congress take action to end the gun violence epidemic that is harming communities across the Nation. We need to protect all people who are vulnerable to gun violence, and this includes survivors of domestic abuse.

Existing Federal laws allow abusive dating partners to access firearms. Known as the “dating partner loophole,” this dangerous gap in Federal law puts survivors of domestic abuse at risk every day.

I thank people for including this and acknowledging that this is an issue. However, it is critical that the Department of Justice swiftly issue regulations and definitions pertaining to the implementation of the dating partner provisions.

The definition of “dating relationship” in this act is not intended to be overly restrictive, and the definition should be broadly constructed to cover dating relationships as commonly understood in the Violence Against Women Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, intimate partner violence is a serious issue, and 50 percent of domestic violence fatalities are caused by their intimate partner. I understand this. I lived in it.

Let's be clear: this is a significant bill. We have made progress, but we have more work to do.

□ 1215

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that legal guns save 162,000 lives annually and prevent 2.5 million crimes a year, or 6,849 crimes every day. By their own admission, criminals fear armed citizens more than they fear the police.

Up to 90 percent of criminals who commit crimes with a gun do not acquire that firearm legally.

We have serious problems in this country involving family, drugs, and mental health. Those issues have been going in the wrong direction for decades. Instead of addressing these issues head-on, the bill will instead jeopardize the right to bear arms for millions of law-abiding citizens.

Decades of Supreme Court precedent prevent the government from exercising prior restraint on our First Amendment rights to free speech. We should not treat the Second Amendment differently.

The Court just spoke forcefully in favor of this right. This body should do the same. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 2938, the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.

As we speak, our Nation is being wracked by an epidemic of gun violence. Every year, 40,000 Americans die from guns, more than 110 every single day, many of them children. We have the power to prevent this carnage, but for decades, Congress refused to act. Well, no more.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not perfect. No bill is. But this legislation will save lives. Once signed into law, the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act will help keep guns out of the wrong hands. It will protect survivors of domestic abuse by closing the boyfriend loophole. It will crack down on straw purchases and improve background checks for people under 21. It will deliver hundreds of millions of dollars for improved mental health services, community-based violence prevention initiatives, and school safety.

The issue of gun safety is personal to me. It is about time that Congress takes action. Let us pass this historic, bipartisan bill and send it to the President's desk today.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this fla-

grantly unconstitutional gun control act. This bill is yet another attack on our God-given rights to self-defense.

For instance, the bill would provide taxpayer dollars for State-level gun confiscations without due process.

We constantly hear this constant theme from the left on how you can't be pro-life and pro-gun, which I think is poignant to point out today. For those who say you can't be pro-life and pro-gun, why did you send billions of dollars of guns to Ukraine to help them save their lives against the Russians?

You sent billions of dollars of guns over there so that our soldiers wouldn't have to go over there and fight a war to save their lives. Guns save lives, or you wouldn't have been sending the money over there.

Our Founding Father, George Mason, who wrote the Virginia Declaration of Rights on which our Constitution's Bill of Rights is based, once said: To disarm the people is the most effectual way to enslave them.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.

We are here today to protect our constituents and save lives. We have waited far too long for this day.

Elements of my bill, the Prevent Gun Trafficking Act, are included in this legislation to crack down on the illegal gun trafficking and straw purchasing that is bringing guns into communities across the country.

I know just how detrimental trafficking can be to a community. Last year, in Chicago, a single stolen gun was linked to at least 27 separate shootings before it was taken off the street. Two dozen people were shot during its use and two of them killed.

More than half of guns used in Chicago shootings are brought into the city by trafficking. Thank you, Wisconsin and Indiana.

We have lost so many people and traumatized countless others.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation to help make Chicagoland a safer place.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE).

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in defense of our Constitution today, in defense of law-abiding American citizens, and against this Senate gun control bill.

This legislation takes the wrong approach in attempting to curb violent crimes. It turns our system of due process on its head. You will now be found guilty and your guns taken away until you can prove your innocence.

It has vague language containing insufficient guardrails to keep guns out of the hands of criminals or prevent mass violence.

It creates a de facto waiting period for up to 10 business days for legal,

law-abiding citizens' firearm purchases and the consideration of whether an adult purchaser's juvenile record should prohibit an individual from buying a firearm.

We are committed to identifying and solving the causes of violent crimes and mental health crises, putting officers in our schools, and reinforcing our school buildings, but we must not infringe upon the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens while doing so.

I cannot support this misguided legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Ms. SHERRILL).

Ms. SHERRILL. Mr. Speaker, today has been a tough day as we watch an extremist and politicized Supreme Court roll back protections Americans have relied on for decades. But there is good news coming out of Congress. We have come together to pass the most comprehensive gun safety package in almost three decades.

In New Jersey, we have already passed a large number of these proposals, including extreme risk protections, assault weapons safeguards, and high-capacity magazine prohibitions, and we have seen the results.

New Jersey has made major progress in combating gun violence. As of 2020, my State has the third lowest level of firearm mortality, according to the CDC. Think about that. The most densely populated State in the Nation has one of the lowest levels of gun violence in the Nation. As the rate of gun deaths has increased by 33 percent nationwide, in New Jersey, it actually fell by 10 percent.

Of course, as a mother, I am focused on keeping our kids safe. This law would have prevented the shooter in Uvalde from getting a firearm without an enhanced background check.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Ms. SHERRILL. This law gives States the support they need to act when a mom worries that her child is contemplating suicide.

It is why everyone from the American Society of Pediatrics to the Fraternal Order of Police has endorsed this bipartisan bill.

It is time for my Republican colleagues to put our Nation's kids ahead of the gun lobby.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE).

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Ohio, soon to be the Judiciary chair, for yielding.

First, thank you to the Supreme Court for removing the curse of abortion sanctioned by a Federal Court ruling back in 1973. Six Supreme Court Justices have stood for life, and that is a beautiful thing.

Now, regarding this gun control bill before us today, this bill would have done nothing to curb the actions of illegal-minded criminals intent on harming our children. But it will harm the law-abiding citizens of this great Nation by violating their Second, Fourth, Fifth, and 14th Amendments, specifically, their due process rights. Let me refresh our collective memories.

The Fourth Amendment: “The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated.”

The Fifth Amendment: “No person shall be . . . deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.”

The 14th Amendment: “Nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.”

Then, of course, my favorite, the Second Amendment: “The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.”

These red flag laws enable one-sided *ex parte* hearings, and though they don’t take some of the guns from all of the people, they take all of the guns from some of the people. This is completely unacceptable.

I stand against it, and I encourage all Members of the House to vote against it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD).

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, today, June 24, 2022, marks 30 years to the day that my father was shot and killed by senseless gun violence. So, I stand here emotional as I prepare to cast a vote in favor of the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, historic legislation that will reduce crime and break the cycle of violence that so many people throughout our country have unfortunately experienced.

One of the most important provisions in this bill is \$2 billion in funding for antiviolence programs, including \$250 million for community violence intervention from my Break the Cycle of Violence legislation.

Every day, 110 Americans are killed with guns, and over 200 are shot and wounded. Amid the global pandemic, homicides by gun increased by 35 percent.

Today, gun violence remains the leading cause of premature death for Black men, as well as the number two cause of premature death for Latino men and Black women.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. HORSFORD. Today, I am casting my vote for my father; the 58 victims who lost their lives during the 1 October shooting in Las Vegas; Sean’Jerrion Coleman, a constituent and a Las Vegas youth leader; and so many other Americans who are victims and survivors of gun violence.

I urge this body to pass the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP), my friend.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in Dobbs earlier this great morning, and in the New York State RPA decision yesterday, the Supreme Court declared something astonishing, which has electrified the country and left radicals seething: The Constitution means what it says.

In New York State RPA, the Court reiterated what Heller decided in 2008. To paraphrase, the decision said: Like we told you the first time, the Second Amendment protects an individual, fundamental right weighed and decided upon by the people at the founding.

But just as most of the courts of appeals flouted Heller by reweighing that right over and over for more than a decade, the Senate again flouts the new decision before the ink is dry.

What is the historical analog from the founding era under which the right to bear arms could be targeted for complete deprivation upon less than complete process rights? Name it. Name the historical analog. That is Congress’ burden.

The renewed assault on the Second Amendment is more than sufficient grounds to oppose this bill, but even the constitutionally permissible components repeat the terrible misjudgment that has afflicted this type of legislation for far too long.

I have said before that you are not grappling with the issue: 60 years of targeted destruction of the American culture by the secular and postmodernist left. Foremost in that destruction has been the unrelenting assault on the family.

So what does this “do something” bill do?

It displaces families further by building a massive new mental health delivery bureaucracy into public school agencies; it connects Medicaid and CHIP directly to schools for early and periodic screening, diagnostic, and treatment services in schools; and it supports the provision of culturally competent and trauma-informed care in school settings.

□ 1230

Americans who have been watching will hear a familiar refrain in that jargon. It means beyond the reach of parents and the reach of common sense.

Who is it that is delivering this double down on woke to your child at school? Republican Senators.

Moms and dads across the country, if you thought that Washington has heard you loud and clear, you are sorely mistaken.

Washington has yet to recognize that it is the author of the devastation we confront, and Washington is still failing to grapple with the core issue. They are taking another step down the long path we have trod that has transformed America just as they want.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman’s time has expired.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this bill is, at the same time, an attack on constitutional rights and a dangerous, poorly thought out, ill-defined improvisation.

Wringing your hands and doing something instead of the right thing will continue having the same result it has had since the 1960s.

Show that honesty and courage does not reside only in the Supreme Court building across the street. Defeat this bill.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE), from the great Empire State.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud New Yorker deeply troubled by the epidemic of gun violence that has plagued our Nation for too long, leaving a wake of sorrow and grief that extends from generation to generation.

I cannot overstate how yesterday’s reckless and detrimental Supreme Court ruling that struck down a 100-year-old New York State law puts innocent Brooklynite lives at risk.

What is more, there are no gun manufacturers in New York City. Yet, despite removing thousands of guns from our streets, illegal guns are arriving by car, train, and bus every single day through the Iron Pipeline.

That is why today’s vote on the Safer Communities Act is an imperative. It addresses the issue of straw purchasing and the gun trafficking that is prevalent across New York City.

Let me take this opportunity to thank and give honorable mention to Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY and Congresswoman LUCY MCBATH for their courageous and unwavering fight to stop this sea of gun violence in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we must pass common-sense gun legislation, and I am proud to vote “yes.”

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Mr. JORDAN, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this anti-Second Amendment legislation. I know firsthand how important firearm ownership and the Second Amendment are for self-defense.

Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago, I was in the batter’s box at a baseball field in Virginia, practicing for our Congressional Baseball Game, when a deranged gunman tried to kill us because we were Republicans.

The attack would have been a massacre if not for the armed U.S. Capitol Police Officers, my heroes, David Bailey and Crystal Griner, who were there.

The actions on that field that day solidified my support for the Second Amendment. Remember, Mr. Speaker,

this gunman wanted to settle his political differences with us, who were trying to fix a broken healthcare system, with bullets on a baseball field.

It is not what we do in the United States of America, but that day, my thought was, I wish I had my firearm to protect myself.

We don't need more laws and restrictions that make it more difficult for law-abiding, gun-owning citizens to exercise their constitutional rights and protect their families.

We need to support law enforcement and get tough on criminals who steal guns and commit violent crimes and further improve mental health programs.

I am a proud gun owner. I am a concealed carry licensee and a strong supporter of our Second Amendment. I always have and always will work to preserve the Second Amendment for law-abiding, American citizens. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this attack to undermine the Second Amendment.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 9 minutes. The gentleman from Ohio has 7 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this gun bill today. After decades of inaction and too many innocent lives lost to senseless gun violence, this is a step we must all take.

It will provide needed resources for violence intervention, school safety, mental health funding, community violence intervention and prevention initiatives, school safety, and yes, enhanced background checks to make it harder for 18- to 21-year-olds to get guns, and it will close the boyfriend loop.

To everybody who is saying no, go tell that to the children and families that lost lives. This bill will keep dangerous weapons out of the hands of people. Go tell your "no" vote to the families and the children who lost lives.

The compromise bill today, it is not perfect, but it will help us save lives. I am proud that the Congressional Black Caucus had a large role to play in this. I thank Congresswomen McBATH and KELLY and Congressman HORSFORD for their support. Our power, our message.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, no one on that side of the aisle cares more about the lives lost than the people on this side of the aisle. We are as heartbroken as anyone is. We are trying to find a balance between the thing that we have all agreed and swore an oath to uphold and defend, the rights granted by God enshrined in our Constitution

and weigh that—and weigh that—with keeping our community safe.

Ladies and gentlemen, our society has a sickness. That is for sure. The laws passed in this House to restrict people from their constitutional, God-given rights that criminals disobey is not going to change that. It is not going to change that.

We can do something great here today. We could. We could do something great in this body, Mr. Speaker, but we are not going to.

We are going to infringe on the rights of the law-abiding who want to defend themselves for the sake of the criminals who refuse to follow the law.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I am prayerful today, and finally today, that I can come on the floor of the House and say to the victims of gun violence and say to those who lost their lives, and to their families, that I can be on the floor of the House today, not just saying, I give you my thoughts and my prayers; not just saying, I want to send to you my sympathies.

I can't tell you how tired I have been coming to the floor, feeling hurt in my heart, and all I could say is thoughts and prayers.

Today I can vote on something that is going to make a meaningful difference to each and every one of them.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ).

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time.

Across this country, we shed tears for the children who are killed, for the parents who are killed, for the girlfriends who are killed.

In this Chamber, we shed tears for the parents and the fathers who are killed, for the children and the sons who are killed.

But we cannot only grieve. We cannot only give our tears. We must act, and today we get to act. Today is the first step toward addressing the pandemic of violence and suffering at the loss of life to guns, to gun violence.

New Mexico already has passed similar laws. We believe in protecting our children. We believe in protecting our women. Those who oppose this law clearly do not.

The Congressional Hispanic Caucus understands that Latinos are too often killed by guns, but today, today, we act. I stand up in support of this action because not acting is an insult to the vast majority of our constituents who want this.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, the leading cause of death of kids in America is now gun violence.

Mr. Speaker, 110 Americans die every day in America because of gun violence.

Five weeks ago, ten people from my community of Buffalo, New York, were shot dead by a white supremacist who planned an attack, drove 300 miles to Buffalo and a Black community of our city.

There was a retired police officer by the name of Aaron Salter. A 30-year veteran of the Buffalo Police Department, he was working security that day.

Someone once said that the best way to stop a bad guy with a gun is a good guy with a gun. Officer Aaron Salter was a good guy with a gun, but he didn't stand a chance. He didn't stand a chance because he was outgunned and outequipped.

Our police officers in America, in Buffalo, and throughout the country are outgunned by the bad guys. They are outprotected by the bad guys.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, when I first took office in March of 2008, one of my first official acts was to attend memorial services for the 17 students killed and injured in the mass shootings at Northern Illinois University.

In the 14 years since, I have attempted to comfort families in my communities again and again, suffering from gun violence like incidents of the shooting at Henry Pratt.

But until today, we had nothing to offer them but our thoughts and prayers. What we are going to pass today may not be enough, but it is a start.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), the co-chair of the Second Amendment Caucus.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding time.

The Democrats today describe this Senate bill as a step forward. If you are saving lives, it is a step backward, folks. If you are banning guns, it is a small step forward. Yes, in fact, it is.

Almost everybody on the other side of the aisle today said, it doesn't go far enough. What do they mean? Well, it is a red flag law bill, and they want to take all of the guns from some of the people.

It doesn't go far enough for them because it doesn't yet take all of the guns from all of the people. That is their goal.

Who has taken a step forward, which institution, which branch of government? Well, actually, if you are counting how many lives are going to be saved, you have to consider that the Supreme Court is the institution, the branch of government, that has taken two steps forward in the last 48 hours to save lives.

One of those steps was to reaffirm the Heller decision that men and

women in this country have the right to defend their own lives.

The second step taken today was to affirm that the State legislatures have the right to defend the lives of the unborn.

This bill is ineffective, unconstitutional, and ill-conceived without consideration for the dangerous unintended consequences.

Did the drafters consider that changing the definition of “gun dealer” to be more ambiguous is going to make every American a gun dealer when they transfer a gun to a friend or a family member?

Did the Senators consider in their sleep deprivation when they drafted this bill hurriedly, late at night, that using childhood mental health records as a basis for denying adults their basic rights to self-defense is going to discourage many parents from seeking mental health care for their children?

If children who need it go without mental health care and early intervention, their conditions will grow worse. We will see more suicides, and we will see more mass shootings. Unfortunately and inevitably, this bill will cost more lives than it will save.

Red flag laws are going to have the same effect that considering mental health care for children will have. People will not seek mental health care, and we will see more damage to the American public.

If politicians here were serious—and they are not serious. They are going to come back. They will be back.

You will be back here in 6 months, a year. You will want another bite at the apple to ban guns because this bill won't do it. This bill won't do what you say.

If you were serious, you would acknowledge that 96 percent of mass public shootings happen in an area where guns are banned, and they would repeal the prohibitions that keep law-abiding citizens from exercising their God-given rights enshrined in the Second Amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

□ 1245

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ).

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act in honor and memory of one of my constituents who was killed in the Las Vegas mass shooting in October 2017, Michelle Vo.

I also rise in the memory of the kids who were killed in Uvalde, Texas, in Parkland, in Sandy Hook.

I rise in their memories, and I also rise due to the fact that I will have a newborn child on August 8. That child, in a few years, will be going off to school, and I will be worried about that child being put in danger because he is going off to school when there are mass shootings across this country.

I rise in support of this because it is a small step forward to prevent the loss of life.

In the end, it comes down to one simple question, as my colleague from northern California posed: Are you with the kids, or are you with the killers? Are you with the victims, or are you with the killers?

I choose the victims; I choose the kids; and I choose the countless lives we will save because we will pass this law.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, let's start with the beginning of the Constitution: “We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare . . .”

That is how our Constitution starts, to uphold the premise of the Declaration of Independence, of freedom to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

This bill helps us move forward because it helps us with life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

My friend complains about the red flag rule. It helps us with those individuals who suffer from domestic violence and who have suicidal ideation, but it also helps the families destroyed at Columbine in my area and at the Aurora movie theater.

This bill that I am so happy to advance today is pro-Constitution, pro-freedom, and pro-liberty.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, experience has taught me when you have to say a bill is constitutional, it is probably not. When you have to say a bill adheres to due process, it probably doesn't. And this bill certainly doesn't.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I stand here in strong support of the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.

It was just 1 year ago when a young man went into the store, bought a gun, and, just hours later, went to an Asian spa in the Atlanta, Georgia area to murder Asian women. Then, he drove 27 miles away to two more Asian spas to kill more Asian women. In all, he killed eight people, including six Asian women.

They were mothers, grandmothers, daughters, and I will never forget the tears and sobs of their loved ones when we went down to Georgia to visit.

To see that again in Buffalo and Uvalde, where families had their lives ripped apart in an instant, is more heartache than our country can bear.

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act is an important step forward. There will be enhanced background

checks for gun purchasers under 21. It provides funds for States for red flag laws. It closes the boyfriend loophole.

This bill will save lives.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, again, I urge a “no” vote on this legislation.

Proponents say that this bill doesn't violate due process. Nothing could be further from the truth.

You haven't been charged with a crime, but there is a hearing, a hearing that you are not allowed to be at. You can't be present at a hearing where you don't have a lawyer and a hearing where a judge can take your property.

Again, just to underscore this, you haven't been charged with a crime, but there is a hearing where your property and your rights are at stake.

You are not allowed to be there; your lawyer is not allowed to be there; and you can't confront your accuser. But they can take your gun; they can take your property; and they can take your Second Amendment liberty.

Here is the scariest part of all: As my friend from Kentucky just pointed out, the Democrats say this is just the first step, that this doesn't go far enough. Holy cow. So that kind of proceeding doesn't go far enough when it comes to your Second Amendment liberties?

One of the key things that separates this great Nation from all other countries is how we have due process in our justice system. This bill takes it away. No other way to put it.

You can say all day long that it doesn't violate due process, but as I said just a few minutes ago, every time I hear that, experience has taught me that it most certainly does. When you have to say it, it probably does. In this case, it is certainly violating due process. There are other problems, but for that reason alone, we should vote “no.”

Again, the scariest thing of all is that they are saying: “Oh, this is just the first step. This doesn't go far enough.” Imagine where they want to take us.

Their beef is with the Second Amendment. They want it to go away. Don't let it happen. I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the difference between this country and other countries is only that in this country do we have mass shootings and mass murders of children. No other country has them.

We know from the experience in New Jersey, as Ms. SHERRILL told us, that when we pass strong gun control legislation, we can greatly reduce the number of children and adults shot.

We hear from the other side of the aisle, “No, we don't want to do that.” They are right: This legislation is the beginning.

This legislation is not perfect. It is a bipartisan compromise. It is not nearly what we should do. It is not nearly what the House did, but it is a beginning. It is a beginning in saving lives in this country.

Anyone who stands in its way is standing in the way of saving lives in this country. I will not allow myself or anyone I associate with to stand in the way of saving lives, many lives.

Again, I remind you, this is the only country that has it, and it is not because we have more mentally ill than other countries. It is because we do not have the gun control laws that other countries do.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone to vote for this bill as a good beginning, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, long overdue legislation to address gun violence in our schools and neighborhoods. Although this legislation is far from perfect, it is an important step forward in solving the epidemic of gun violence that has gripped our Nation for decades.

In the weeks following the tragedy in Uvalde at Robb Elementary and the racist attack at a grocery store in Buffalo, I spoke with many constituents who continue to urge action. Teachers, parents, and concerned community members from Northwest Oregon shared pleas for Congress to follow through on our responsibility to our children and our Nation by immediately passing bold policies to implement gun safety reform. An educator I know told me that after Uvalde, she sat down with her students and told them she would take a bullet for them. Conversations like this are happening in classrooms across the country, but they shouldn't have to. Congress must provide all students with safe learning environments free from the threat of gun violence. The House already passed a comprehensive slate of gun violence prevention legislation, and I look forward to building on that by voting for this legislation that came out of the bipartisan Senate negotiations.

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act will help to protect Americans and make gun sales safer. The most effective way to protect communities from gun violence is to keep guns out of the hands of individuals who are a danger to themselves and others. This legislation will incentivize states to establish extreme risk protection order laws, enhance background checks for people under the age of 21, end straw purchasing, and penalize gun traffickers. It will also safeguard survivors of domestic violence by closing the so-called "boyfriend loophole," prohibiting people convicted of domestic violence crimes from possessing firearms.

Additionally, this bill makes a robust investment in Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants under Title IV–A of the Every Student Succeeds Act. Fully funding this important grant program will help to close the opportunity and resource gaps in our Nation's public schools, and I'm pleased this bill recognizes the importance of this program in providing students of all backgrounds with a well-rounded, safe, and healthy education.

Although these actions to address gun violence in our communities and fund critical school improvement programs are important, I am concerned about how various provisions in the bill could harm Black and brown students and students with disabilities in our Nation's schools. The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act increases funding for school resource officers (SROs) and codifies further involvement of the Department of Homeland Security in

education through threat assessments. Research and practice show that both SROs and threat assessments are ineffective in keeping students safe in schools. As Chair of the Civil Rights and Human Services Subcommittee, I remain committed to protecting students' civil rights and delivering on the promise of an equitable, world-class public education for each and every student in this country. I will closely monitor the implementation of this legislation to make sure our most marginalized and vulnerable students are not subject to further disproportionate discipline and discriminatory targeting in schools.

As a member of the Gun Violence Prevention Taskforce, I again want to recognize how crucial the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act is to our schools, communities, and country. This bill will be the first substantive action on gun violence prevention since the passage of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act in 1994. In the last 30 years, our Nation has been devastated over and over again by horrific tragedies like we saw in recent weeks at Robb Elementary in Uvalde, Texas. We cannot bring back those who have been murdered, but we can enact meaningful laws that will prevent more senseless deaths.

I urge swift passage of the legislation.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to enter into a colloquy with my esteemed colleague from California, Congressman MIKE THOMPSON, regarding the S. 2938, Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.

Mr. THOMPSON, is it your understanding and intent in supporting this bill that the Department of Justice promulgate regulations pertaining to Section 12005?

Is it further your understanding and intent in supporting this bill that the Department of Justice in those regulations define the meaning of the terms 'serious,' 'continuing,' 'recent,' and 'recently'?

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Congresswoman from Michigan, DEBBIE DINGELL, is correct. It is the intent that the Department of Justice promulgate regulations to govern the application of Section 12005, including defining the terms 'serious,' 'continuing,' 'recent,' and 'recently.' It is the intent that this law capture dating relationships in the way they happen in the lives of victims of dating violence.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad for the clarification from the gentleman from California and pleased to know it is the legislative intent that the Department of Justice promulgate regulations to govern the application of section 12005, including defining the terms 'serious,' 'recent,' and 'recently.' A consistent and authoritative interpretation of these terms that is reflective of the lived experiences of survivors of dating violence is critical to the successful implementation of this section.

Rulemaking is necessary to both ensure that in its application, the law actually protects victims of dating violence and to stave off chaos. A lack of clearly defined terms will encourage trial level litigation into the specifics of the intimate relationship. State judges who are adjudicating these cases will be determining the relationship between the victim and the perpetrator based on the laws of their state. The introduction of 'serious,' 'continuing,' and 'recent' should not be read to require judges to include specific findings of seriousness or continuity. Instead, the existence of a dating relationship must be determined based on the

enumerated factors set forth in subparagraph (B) of this section, with the acknowledgment that a finding of a dating relationship under a state law with a definition that is substantially similar to federal law constitutes a finding of 'dating relationship' for the purpose of this section.

For example, in my state of Michigan, the term 'dating relationship' means 'frequent, intimate associations primarily characterized by the expectation of affectional involvement. This term does not include a casual relationship or an ordinary fraternization between two individuals in a business or social context.' This very clearly parallels the definition of 'dating relationship' in the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, and a finding of a 'dating relationship' under Michigan law must constitute a finding of a 'dating relationship' for the purposes of this section.

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act shrinks the dating loophole, but it does not eliminate it. I will keep leading the fight to fully close it in future legislation. No dating abuser who has shown by his actions that he poses a danger to his victim, whose actions led to the issuance of a protective order after a hearing, should be legally allowed to possess firearms for the duration of the order.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the comments of my esteemed colleague from Michigan. Under California law, 'dating relationship' means frequent, intimate associations primarily characterized by the expectation of affectional or sexual involvement independent of financial considerations. Similar to the law in Michigan, the law in California very clearly parallels the definition of 'dating relationship' in the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, and it is my intent and understand in voting for this bill that a conviction for a misdemeanor crime of domestic violence against a dating partner under California law is sufficient to trigger the expanded dating violence prohibitor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1204, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 193, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 299]

YEAS—234

Adams	Bowman	Casten
Aguilar	Boyle, Brendan	Castor (FL)
Allred	F.	Castro (TX)
Auchincloss	Brown (MD)	Chabot
Axne	Brown (OH)	Cheney
Barragán	Brownley	Cherfilus-
Bass	Bush	McCormick
Beatty	Bustos	Chu
Bera	Butterfield	Cioccine
Beyer	Carbajal	Clark (MA)
Bishop (GA)	Cárdenas	Clarke (NY)
Blumenauer	Carson	Cleaver
Blunt Rochester	Carter (LA)	Clyburn
Bonamici	Cartwright	Cohen
Bourdeaux	Case	Connolly

Cooper	Khanna	Porter	Jackson	Meuser	Simpson	Strickland	Turner (Gonzalez)	Watson Coleman
Correa	Kildee	Pressley	Johnson (LA)	Miller (IL)	Smith (MO)	(Neguse)	(OH)	(Pallone)
Costa	Kilmer	Price (NC)	Johnson (OH)	Miller (WV)	Smith (NE)	Suozi (Neguse)	Underwood	Wenstrup
Courtney	Kim (NJ)	Quigley	Johnson (SD)	Miller-Meeks	Smith (NJ)	Takano (Chu)	(Neguse)	(LaHood)
Craig	Kind	Raskin	Jordan	Moolenaar	Smucker	Taylor (Nehls)	Van Drew	Wilson (FL)
Crist	Kinzinger	Rice (NY)	Joyce (PA)	Mooney	Spartz	Timmons	(Reschenthaler)	(Williams)
Crow	Kirkpatrick	Rice (SC)	Keller	Moore (AL)	Staubert	(Wilson (SC))	Walorski (Baird)	(GA)
Cuellar	Krishnamoorthi	Ross	Kelly (MS)	Moore (UT)	Steel	Tlaib (Gomez)	Wasserman	Wittman (Carl)
Davids (KS)	Kuster	Roybal-Allard	Kelly (PA)	Mullin	Stefanik		Schultz (Soto)	
Davis, Danny K.	Lamb	Ruiz	Kim (CA)	Murphy (NC)	Steil			
Dean	Langevin	Ruppersberger	Kustoff	Nehls	Steube			
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Rush	LaHood	Newhouse	Stewart			
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Ryan	LaMalfa	Norman	Taylor			
DeLauro	Lawrence	Salazar	Lamborn	Oberholte	Tenney			
DelBene	Lawson (FL)	Sánchez	Latta	Owens	Thompson (PA)			
Demings	Lee (CA)	Sarbanes	LaTurner	Palazzo	Tiffany			
DeSaulnier	Lee (NV)	Scanlon	Lesko	Palmer	Timmons			
Deutch	Leger Fernandez	Schakowsky	Letlow	Perry	Valadao			
Dingell	Levin (CA)	Schiff	Long	Pfuger	Van Drew			
Doggett	Levin (MI)	Schneider	Loudermilk	Posey	Van Duyne			
Doyle, Michael	Lieu	Schrader	Lucas	Reschenthaler	Wagner			
F.	Lofgren	Schrier	Luetkemeyer	Rodgers (WA)	Walberg			
Escobar	Lowenthal	Scott (VA)	Mace	Rogers (AL)	Walorski			
Eshoo	Luria	Scott, David	Malliotakis	Rogers (KY)	Waltz			
Espallat	Lynch	Sewell	Mann	Rose	Weber (TX)			
Evans	Malinowski	Sherman	Massie	Rosendale	Webster (FL)			
Fitzpatrick	Maloney,	Sherrill	Mast	Rouzer	Wenstrup			
Fletcher	Carolyn B.	Sires	McCarthy	Roy	Westerman			
Foster	Maloney, Sean	Slotkin	McCauley	Rutherford	Williams (TX)			
Frankel, Lois	Manning	Smith (WA)	McClain	Scalise	Wilson (SC)			
Galleo	Matsui	Soto	McClintock	Schweikert	Wittman			
Garamendi	McBath	Spanberger	McHenry	Scott, Austin	Womack			
Garcia (IL)	McCollum	Speier	McKinley	Sessions				
Garcia (TX)	McEachin	Stansbury						
Golden	McGovern	Stanton						
Gomez	McNerney	Stevens						
Gonzales, Tony	Meeks	Strickland						
Gonzalez (OH)	Meijer	Suozi	Conway	Pence	Zeldin			
Gonzalez,	Meng	Swalwell						
Vicente	Mfume	Takano						
Gottheimer	Moore (WI)	Thompson (CA)						
Green, Al (TX)	Morelle	Thompson (MS)						
Grijalva	Moulton	Titus						
Harder (CA)	Mrvan	Tlaib						
Hayes	Murphy (FL)	Tonko						
Higgins (NY)	Nadler	Torres (CA)						
Himes	Napolitano	Torres (NY)						
Horsford	Neal	Trahan						
Houlahan	Neguse	Trone						
Hoyer	Newman	Turner						
Huffman	Norcross	Underwood						
Jackson Lee	O'Halleran	Upton						
Jacobs (CA)	Ocasio-Cortez	Vargas						
Jacobs (NY)	Omar	Veasey						
Jayapal	Pallone	Velázquez						
Jeffries	Panetta	Wasserman						
Johnson (GA)	Pappas	Schultz						
Johnson (TX)	Pascarell	Waters						
Jones	Payne	Watson Coleman						
Joyce (OH)	Pelosi	Welch						
Kahele	Perlmutter	Wexton						
Kaptur	Peters	Wild						
Katko	Phillips	Williams (GA)						
Keating	Pingree	Wilson (FL)						
Kelly (IL)	Pocan	Yarmuth						

NAYS—193

Aderholt	Carter (TX)	Gallagher
Allen	Cawthorn	Garbarino
Amodei	Cline	Garcia (CA)
Armstrong	Cloud	Gibbs
Arrington	Clyde	Gimenez
Babin	Cole	Gohmert
Bacon	Comer	Good (VA)
Baird	Crawford	Gooden (TX)
Balderson	Crenshaw	Gosar
Banks	Curtis	Granger
Barr	Davidson	Graves (LA)
Bentz	Davis, Rodney	Graves (MO)
Bergman	DesJarlais	Green (TN)
Bice (OK)	Diaz-Balart	Greene (GA)
Biggs	Donalds	Griffith
Bilirakis	Duncan	Grothman
Bishop (NC)	Dunn	Guest
Boebert	Ellzey	Guthrie
Bost	Emmer	Harris
Brady	Estes	Harshbarger
Brooks	Fallon	Hartzler
Buchanan	Feenstra	Hern
Buck	Ferguson	Herrrell
Bucshon	Fischbach	Herrera Beutler
Budd	Fitzgerald	Hice (GA)
Burchett	Fleischmann	Higgins (LA)
Burgess	Flores	Hill
Calvert	Fox	Hinson
Cammack	Franklin, C.	Hollingsworth
Carey	Scott	Hudson
Carl	Fulcher	Huizenga
Carter (GA)	Gaetz	Issa

Jackson	Meuser	Simpson
Johnson (LA)	Miller (IL)	Smith (MO)
Johnson (OH)	Miller (WV)	Smith (NE)
Johnson (SD)	Miller-Meeks	Smith (NJ)
Jordan	Moolenaar	Smucker
Joyce (PA)	Mooney	Spartz
Keller	Moore (AL)	Staubert
Kelly (MS)	Moore (UT)	Steel
Kelly (PA)	Mullin	Stefanik
Kim (CA)	Murphy (NC)	Steil
Kustoff	Nehls	Steube
LaHood	Newhouse	Stewart
LaMalfa	Norman	Taylor
Lamborn	Oberholte	Tenney
Latta	Owens	Thompson (PA)
LaTurner	Palazzo	Tiffany
Lesko	Palmer	Timmons
Letlow	Perry	Valadao
Long	Pfuger	Van Drew
Loudermilk	Posey	Van Duyne
Lucas	Reschenthaler	Wagner
Luetkemeyer	Rodgers (WA)	Walberg
Mace	Rogers (AL)	Walorski
Malliotakis	Rogers (KY)	Waltz
Mann	Rose	Weber (TX)
Massie	Rosendale	Webster (FL)
Mast	Rouzer	Wenstrup
McCarthy	Roy	Westerman
McCauley	Rutherford	Williams (TX)
McClain	Scalise	Wilson (SC)
McClintock	Schweikert	Wittman
McHenry	Scott, Austin	Womack
McKinley	Sessions	

NOT VOTING—3

□ 1326

So the motion to concur was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I was not in Washington, D.C. and not present for votes today. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 299.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Gomez)	Duncan	Krishnamoorthi
Auchincloss	(Norman)	(Neguse)
(Beyer)	Espallat	LaMalfa (Van
Babin (Weber	(Correa)	Duyne)
(TX))	Fletcher	Lamborn (Wilson
Barr (McHenry)	(Pallone)	(SC))
Barragan	Frankel, Lois	Lawson (FL)
(Correa)	(Kuster)	(Soto)
Boebert (Bishop	Garcia (IL)	Manning (Bera)
(NC))	(Beyer)	McEachin
Bonamici (Beyer)	Gibbs (Bucshon)	(Beyer)
Bourdeaux	Gimenez (Waltz)	Moore (WI)
(Correa)	Gohmert (Weber	(Beyer)
Bowman (Chu)	(TX))	Moulton
Gohmert	Gottheimer	(Stevens)
(Stevens)	(Neguse)	Newman (Beyer)
Bush (Williams	Guest	Palazzo
(GA))	(Fleischmann)	(Fleischmann)
Cárdenas	Hartzler (Bacon)	Pascarell
(Gomez)	Hayes (Neguse)	(Pallone)
Carter (LA)	Hice (GA)	Payne (Pallone)
(Williams	(Bishop (NC))	Porter (Neguse)
(GA))	Jackson Lee	Pressley
Carter (TX)	(Cicilline)	(Trahan)
(Weber (TX))	Jacobs (NY)	Price (NC)
Casten (Foster)	(Smucker)	(DeLauro)
Cawthorn	Jayapal (Gomez)	Rice (SC)
(Donalds)	Jeffries (Neguse)	(Meijer)
Cherfilus-	Johnson (GA)	Rogers (KY)
McCormick	(Williams	(Reschenthaler)
(Williams	(GA))	Rush (Neguse)
(GA))	Johnson (TX)	Salazar (Diaz-
Cohen (Beyer)	(Stevens)	Balart)
Costa (Correa)	Katko (Meijer)	Sires (Pallone)
Crist (Soto)	Keating (Neguse)	Spartz
Davis, Danny K.	Khanna (Ocasio-	(Harshbarger)
(Gomez)	Cortez)	Stansbury
DeSaulnier	Kinzinger	(Stevens)
(Beyer)	(Meijer)	Steube
Doyle, Michael	Kirkpatrick	(Franklin, C.
F. (Pallone)	(Pallone)	Scott)

□ 1330

RECOGNIZING ART COMPETITION WINNER LIERA BERTOLSIO

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I welcome Liera Bertolsio and her family to Washington, D.C. to celebrate her great accomplishment.

Liera is the 2022 winner of Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District Congressional Art Contest.

The annual art competition, organized by the Congressional Institute, showcases the creative talents of high school students from across every congressional district in the country.

Liera has just finished her sophomore year at Forest Hills High School located in Sidman, Pennsylvania. Her work "Girl with Pearl Earring" is an acrylic painting on canvas.

This year, 81 students entered Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District art competition. Liera's work was selected by a panel of independent judges. The 2022 competition had our largest number of entries to date.

All the winning pieces from around the country will be displayed for the year in the Cannon tunnel where they will be viewed by Members of Congress, staff, and those who visit the Capitol every day.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I congratulate Liera on her remarkable achievement.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MRVAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am very proud to have a dear friend and colleague on the floor with me.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ).

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Speaker, I believe we are here today and today is a very heavy day for so many of us across the country.

Every single one of us woke up today with less rights than we had yesterday. Pregnant people, in particular, are in more danger in the United States today than we were yesterday as a result of the Supreme Court's decision to overturn Roe v. Wade.

I think what we are experiencing here—it is important to tell the truth of what is going on. With so many individuals out here, I think it is important for us to also tackle this myth that this is somehow about babies or children or life because the same individuals who purport and who claim to be protecting life, fight against universal healthcare.

Do they believe in universal childcare?

Do they believe in life after birth?

From their policy positions, I assure you the evidence is lacking.

A party and individuals who claim to protect the lives of children, just weeks after over a dozen children died in Texas, now claim to support their life—the lives of the young.

Who are we protecting?

Who does this protect?

No one.

Overtaking Roe puts every single one of us in danger. What I think many of our colleagues perhaps haven't quite—or perhaps they have—fully understood is that this also undermines the right to privacy in the United States of America. We are here to solve this issue. Our job is to develop a path forward. In that, we know that this House has passed and is willing to codify Roe.

What we also need is answers from our colleagues in the United States Senate. To those Senators who voted for these Justices under the claim and the guise that this would not happen, this decision falls on them.

What will they do—as they were lied to?

What will they do as a consequence of this decision, whether that be Republican or Democrat?

We cannot allow this to go unanswered. We are talking about a court, with the majority of Justices appointed by a party that has not won a popular Presidential election more than once in 30 years, ruling against the majority of Americans. We have a Senate that is controlled by minority rule. We have a House suffering from the impacts of gerrymandering that amplifies and undermines our democracy.

We are in a very dangerous moment, not just for women, not just for LGBT communities, not just for all of us, but we are in a dangerous moment in the world because this is not just about the right to choose. This is about rule of law and democracy, and who is a full person in the eyes of the law.

To all of those who are watching today's events unfold in fear, in anger, in rage, in depression, in anxiety, one thing remains steady: that we will not stop fighting until this is fixed. I say that to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. We are not going away. We stay. We fight. We push. We will not be silenced.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her message, and I assure her that I will be part of that fight.

□ 1345

There are some fights that you cannot escape. I believe that women should have the right to choose. It is not my choice. It is the choice of the woman. I hope that we will see a time when the Supreme Court will realize that it has made a mistake that has to be corrected.

But today I am here primarily and principally to talk about a state of affairs in Texas. Sadly, regrettably, and unfortunately, the GOP—the Grand Old Party, the party of Lincoln—has degenerated and devolved into what I call the COT, the cult of Trump. The party of Lincoln has devolved into the cult of Trump. It is no longer the Lincolnian party firmly planted on the bedrock of the democratic principles, government of the people, by the people, and for the people. It has deteriorated into the Trumpian party firmly planted on the dubious ground of “government of Trump, by Trump, and for Trump.”

This is best evidenced and evinced by juxtaposing the public policy stance taken by the GOP with the public policy stance codified and voted on by the Texas Republican Party—the COT, the cult of Trump—on June 18, 2022, at their party convention in Houston, Texas. And juxtaposing, the GOP, the party of Lincoln that took a stand and fought to keep the Union together, the COT, the cult of Trump, has taken a stand to secede from the Union literally. Texas now under Republican leadership desires to leave the Union.

When I say Republican leadership, I mean those persons who participated in the convention. The Governor sent a message and State-elected officials were a party to it. Either directly or in some vicarious way they were all affiliated and associated. They knew about this vote that was taken, and either they voted for it, or they have acquiesced to it.

The GOP, the party of Lincoln historically, accepted and participated in the peaceful transfer of Presidential power. The COT, the cult of Trump, rejects the certified results of the 2022 Presidential election and holds that President Biden was not legitimately elected by the people. This is all news that has taken place in the State of Texas recently—as of June 18, 2022—Texas wanting to leave the Union by and through the GOP.

Now the cult of Trump and also the Texas Republican Party indicated that President Biden is not the President. They went so far as to say that they reject the certified results of the 2022 Presidential election that holds that President Biden was elected but they say not legitimately elected.

Lastly, of the many things that I could mention—but it is something that is critical to people of color and women—the GOP, the party of Lincoln, forged the 15th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution recognizing the right of former slaves to vote. Under the hand of GOP President George W. Bush, a 25-year reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act was signed into law.

On the other hand, the COT, the cult of Trump, urges that the Voting Rights Act of 1965, codified and updated in 1973, be repealed and not reauthorized. The Texas former Republican Party, now the cult of Trump, would repeal and not reauthorize the Voting Rights Act.

Should this happen, the gender, complexion, and diversity of the Congress will change significantly.

Here is why: In 1965, when our dear colleague and brother, John Lewis, crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge on what we now call Bloody Sunday, when he crossed the Edmond Pettus Bridge that day, he had to sense what fate was awaiting him on the other side of the bridge. I am not sure he anticipated it would be as dastardly imposed as it was. As he approached the bridge—I have been to the bridge many times; it has a zenith, and it has crest. As you approach the crest, Mr. Speaker, you can see what awaits you on the other side.

On Bloody Sunday in 1965, peaceful protesters were marching from Selma to Montgomery. They were peaceful, doing no one harm, and simply wanting to peacefully demonstrate that they were willing to walk to a city that for years had been a place where there had been persons who were being mistreated and not having the opportunity to vote as other people were voting. But in any event, they were walking, and they came upon the police and the constabulary on horses.

I spoke to my friend, John Lewis, about this. He said he thought he was going to die because they started beating them. They beat them all the way back to the church where they started. It was a sad day in history. It was a sad day in the history of this country and a sad day in the history of the world. The camera's eye caught what was happening, and it was broadcast around the world.

A President from Texas, Lyndon Johnson, wanted to do what he ultimately did. But he didn't have the momentum to get it done until Bloody Sunday when people saw the meanness, the hate, and just the desire to harm peaceful people. When they saw all of this, it gave him that momentum that he had been seeking. I admire him. He was able to get the Voting Rights Act of 1965 signed.

That Voting Rights Act of 1965 changed the diversity in Congress, the complexion of Congress, and the agenda of Congress. This is the same Voting Rights Act, Mr. Speaker, that the cult in Texas—the COT, the cult of Trump, no longer the Grand Old Party, the GOP—they would not reauthorize, they would repeal it.

President Johnson signed the Voting Rights Act. At the time he signed it in 1965 in the 89th Congress, there were four Asian Members—four. There were four Latino Members, six Black Members, and 13 women in the Congress.

There were four Asians in 1965. Now, fast-forward to 2022, the 117th Congress.

There are 21 Asian Members. Before the Voting Rights Act became law, there were four. In 2022, there are 21. Before the Voting Rights Act, there were four Latino Members. In 2022, there are 52. The Voting Rights Act has afforded opportunities that were not there prior to Bloody Sunday.

There were six Black Members in 1965. In 2022, there are 61 Black Members. I am proud to be one of them—61. I would daresay that but for the Voting Rights Act of 1965, I would not be one of the 61. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 has made a difference in the complexion of Congress. There were thirteen women in 1965. In 2022 there are 151 women.

You see, Mr. Speaker, when the Voting Rights Act of 1965 made it possible for African Americans to have these opportunities, it did open the door for others as well. It opened the door for people of color. They were not the slaves that benefited from the 13th Amendment, but they were people who benefited from the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

It also provided people in my congressional district to have a ballot printed in more than one language. Houston is a polyglot city. Many languages are spoken. The ballot in the Ninth Congressional District, where I am fortunate enough to serve, is printed in four different languages: English, Spanish, Vietnamese, and Chinese. The Voting Rights Act made that possible. It has been reauthorized and amended such that language has been made a part of the Voting Rights Act giving people the opportunity to simply vote in a language that they understand. Some people would say: Well, they should all speak English.

Well, there are some Native Alaskans who don't necessarily find English as their native tongue. They are citizens. They ought to be able to vote. They are people who acquired citizenship and speak another language. They speak English well enough to have the kinds of conversations that can help in your daily life, but when you are casting a vote for President of the United States or some other public office such as judgeships, it would serve people well to be able to do this with the language they are most comfortable with. Hence, we have the ballot in these four languages.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 has made, and continues to make, a difference notwithstanding the fact that a significant portion of it has been eviscerated. We still have section 2 of the Voting Rights Act to help prevent invidious discrimination that Texas is known for, by the way. Texas is the home of invidious discrimination. Texas has twice left its place in countries where slavery was not acceptable. Rather than remain, Texas has seceded. Texas left Mexico because of slavery, and Texas left the United States because of slavery. So the Voting Rights Act of 1965 has made a difference.

But the State of Texas through many of its agents, and especially those associated with the cult of Trump—formerly known as the GOP, the Grand Old Party—many of those agents would repeal the Voting Rights Act which would make a great difference in who speaks at this microphone and who walks the Halls of Congress.

It seems that in Texas if you can't conform with the law or you don't want to, then you just simply change the law.

□ 1400

And that is what they seek to do now, to change the law, rather than allow the diversity to exist that we currently see. They would change the law and roll back the clock; and I assure you, the diversity that we currently experience would cease to exist.

So I am here to say that the Voting Rights Act of 1965 must be reauthorized. It must be.

I understand that the Supreme Court seems to be hostile to the rights of minorities, hostile to the rights of women. My dear friend, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, spoke quite eloquently on the subject.

I indicated that this was my last topic, as it relates to the cult in Texas, but I do have to confess that in Texas, the former GOP, now the cult of Trump, bans abortions, or would ban abortions—this is what they codified and published—would ban abortion from the moment of fertilization. That means that there would be no legal abortions in Texas from the moment of fertilization.

I do have sympathy for women who are raped. There would be no options, from the moment of fertilization. It appears, at least to some, that this would also mean, even if the mother's life is in question. This is as draconian as a law can be.

Women should have the right to choose. It is their body. I can have opinions, but they have to deal with the reality. And it is not an easy reality for many women to confront.

So this is something they should have the opportunity to talk about with their most trusted confidantes and make hard choices. I don't wish the choice upon anyone, but I do think that women ought to have that choice.

And my hope is that, as I indicated earlier, I live long enough to see a Supreme Court that will realize that *Roe v. Wade*—the decision in *Roe v. Wade* was a decision that gave women the opportunity to make choices that only they should have the opportunity to make.

Mr. Speaker, these are some very difficult times. I see many people celebrating. But I also know that when I called a friend to discuss this, there were many tears being shed. And not everybody is happy today. For many people, this is a very dark day in the life of our country.

Just yesterday, or the day before—the days run together sometimes when

you are up late—the Supreme Court ruled that you can carry your gun openly, notoriously.

I don't want to live in a world where my safety is dependent upon my having an automatic Kalashnikov model 47, or some replica of an AR-15. I don't want my safety to depend upon my being—having the quickest draw. I don't want to resolve my disputes with a gun.

I just think this is a very difficult time for us. And my prayer is that we will have persons in the Senate who will understand that there is little time left for us to make a difference.

We have the House, meaning Democrats. We have the Senate, and we have the Presidency. There is just little time left. But there is enough time left for us to make a difference if we choose to.

And my prayer is that those Senators will understand that either we take up our agenda now, or we risk not having the opportunity to take it up within the foreseeable future. That is what we risk.

I hope that they will see that now is the time to deal with a woman's right to choose. The legislation is there.

Now is the time to deal with gun safety laws that can prevent 18-year-olds from having weapons of war.

Now is the time to take up voting rights, so that all persons will have an equal opportunity to serve.

Now is the time to take up an agenda that will make America the beautiful a more beautiful America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SERGEANT AT ARMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 23, 2022.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, following consultation with the Office of Attending Physician, I write to provide you further notification that the public health emergency due to the novel coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 remains in effect.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. WALKER,
Sergeant at Arms.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the extension, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 8, and effective June 29, 2022, of the "covered period" designated on January 4, 2021.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. on Tuesday, June 28, 2022.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, June 28, 2022, at 9 a.m.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Member executed the oath for access to classified information:

Mayra Flores

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-4427. A letter from the President and Chair of the Board of Directors, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting transactions pursuant to section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3); July 31, 1945, ch. 341, Sec. 2 (as added by Public Law 102-266, Sec. 102); (106 Stat. 95); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-4428. A letter from the President and Chair of the Board of Directors, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting transactions pursuant to section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3); July 31, 1945, ch. 341, Sec. 2 (as added by Public Law 102-266, Sec. 102); (106 Stat. 95); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-4429. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 22-010; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4430. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 21-085; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4431. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 21-026; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4432. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 20-077; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4433. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 22-004; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MCGOVERN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1204. A resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the House amendment to the bill (S. 2938) to designate the United States Courthouse and Federal Building located at 111 North Adams Street in Tallahassee, Florida,

as the "Joseph Woodrow Hatchett United States Courthouse and Federal Building", and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the bill (S. 2089) to amend the Families First Coronavirus Response Act to extend child nutrition waiver authority, and for other purposes; relating to consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 4346) making appropriations for Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes; and for other purposes (Rept. 117-385). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BEYER: Joint Economic Committee. Report of the Joint Economic Committee on the 2022 Economic Report of the President (Rept. 117-386). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEUTCH: Committee on Ethics. In the Matter of Allegations Relating to Delegate Michael F.Q. San Nicolas (Rept. 117-387). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. MCCOLLUM: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 8236. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2023, and for other purposes (Rept. 117-388). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 8237. A bill making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2023, and for other purposes (Rept. 117-389). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. DELAURO: Committee on Appropriations. Report on the Suballocation of Budget Allocations for Fiscal Year 2023 (Rept. 117-390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PALMER:

H.R. 8221. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require States to submit a report to the Election Assistance Commission that includes information with respect to the voter list maintenance activities of the State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PALMER:

H.R. 8222. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to eliminate reliance on the change of address information provided by the United States Postal Service for the purpose of removing ineligible voters from the official list of voters in a State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PALMER (for himself, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. CAREY, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. GIMENEZ, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. TIFANY, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. WESTERMAN):

H.R. 8223. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to permit a State to include as part of the mail voter registration form a requirement that applicants provide proof of citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. BOEBERT (for herself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 8224. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to carry out certain offshore oil and gas lease sales and finalize the next offshore oil and gas leasing program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CAWTHORN:

H.R. 8225. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the treatment of anesthesiologist assistants in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. CRAIG (for herself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. OMAR, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. EMMER, and Mrs. FISCHBACH):

H.R. 8226. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 236 Concord Exchange North in South Saint Paul, Minnesota, as the "Officer Leo Pavlak Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida (for herself, Mr. BUCK, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Ms. JAYAPAL):

H.R. 8227. A bill to limit the judicial enforceability of predispute nondisclosure and nondisparagement contract clauses relating to disputes involving sexual assault and sexual harassment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 8228. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for punishment for the knowing distribution of fentanyl, if death results, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MANNING (for herself, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 8229. A bill to clarify the applicability of certain parity provisions to mental health and substance use disorder telehealth benefits; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. MEIJER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CAWTHORN, and Mr. BENTZ):

H.R. 8230. A bill to terminate certain contracts relating to the construction of the border fence and to transfer unused border fence material to the States along the southwest border; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 8231. A bill to authorize a grant program to support equitable access to postsecondary STEM pathways; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself, Mr. TIFANY, and Mr. DAVIDSON):

H.R. 8232. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to provide that authority under the Act can only be exercised during a period in which Congress has formally declared war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SABLÁN (for himself, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BASS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. EVANS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 8233. A bill to authorize grants to be made on an equitable basis to highest courts to assess and improve the handling of foster care and adoption proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAN NICOLAS:

H.R. 8234. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue certain regulations to amend title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, to establish an exception for the straight-line distance requirement for an airplane single-engine rating, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. VAN DUYNE (for herself and Mr. ROUZER):

H.R. 8235. A bill to amend subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code, regarding prevalent wage determinations in order to expand access to affordable housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. HUDSON, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H. Res. 1205. A resolution recognizing Russian actions in Ukraine as a genocide; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. MAST, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. TRONE, and Ms. STEFANIK):

H. Res. 1206. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the month of June 2022 as "National Post-Traumatic Stress Injury Awareness Month" and June 27, 2022, as "National Post-Traumatic Stress Injury Awareness Day"; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MAST, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DONALDS, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. DUNN, Mr. CRIST, Mr. SOTO, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. STEUBE, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Mr. WALTZ):

H. Res. 1207. A resolution expressing the profound sorrow of the House of Representatives for the victims of the collapse of the Champlain Towers South condominium building in Surfside, Florida; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. PALMER:

H.R. 8221.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of choosing Senators.

By Mr. PALMER:

H.R. 8222.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of choosing Senators.

By Mr. PALMER:

H.R. 8223.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of choosing Senators.

By Mrs. BOEBERT:

H.R. 8224.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CAWTHORN:

H.R. 8225.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. CRAIG:

H.R. 8226.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida:

H.R. 8227.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 8228.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One Section Eight

By Ms. MANNING:

H.R. 8229.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS:

H.R. 8230.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 8231.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 8232.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SABLÁN:

H.R. 8233.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SAN NICOLAS:

H.R. 8234.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 allows Congress to make all laws "which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution" any "other" powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States.

By Ms. VAN DUYNE:

H.R. 8235.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 401: Mr. DAVIDSON.
H.R. 1611: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 1977: Mr. MOOLENAAR.
H.R. 2374: Mr. STAUBER and Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 2483: Ms. DEAN.
H.R. 2806: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 2910: Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 2971: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 3268: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 3290: Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 3294: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 3295: Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 3483: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 3829: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 4118: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 4258: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 4268: Mr. TONKO, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Ms. SCHRIER.
H.R. 4323: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 4636: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 4811: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 4895: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 5607: Mr. MALINOWSKI.
H.R. 6161: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 6202: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 6394: Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 6527: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 6583: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. TORRES of New York.
H.R. 6681: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 6965: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 7223: Mr. BUDD and Mr. RESCHENTHALER.
H.R. 7294: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 7382: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. FEENSTRA, and Ms. JACOBS of California.
H.R. 7438: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 7476: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 7524: Ms. VAN DUYNE.
H.R. 7588: Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas.
H.R. 7644: Ms. WEXTON, Ms. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 7696: Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 7792: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 7930: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 7942: Mr. DONALDS.
H.R. 7961: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 7966: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 8059: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 8107: Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. WELCH, Ms. TLAIB, and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 8137: Mr. HUIZENGA and Mr. JACKSON.
H.R. 8144: Mr. LIEU.

H.R. 8150: Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 8160: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DUNN, and Mr. POSEY.
 H.R. 8167: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
 H.R. 8174: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
 H.R. 8190: Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 8196: Mr. DUNCAN and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
 H.R. 8206: Mr. MASSIE, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. DUNN.
 H.R. 8212: Mr. DONALDS and Mr. STEUBE.
 H.J. Res. 87: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H. Res. 569: Mr. BOST and Mr. VARGAS.
 H. Res. 1132: Ms. SCANLON, Ms. MENG, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. RUIZ.
 H. Res. 1137: Mr. BEYER.
 H. Res. 1148: Mr. WENSTRUP.
 H. Res. 1178: Mr. GRIFFITH.
 H. Res. 1198: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, and Mr. MCEACHIN.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 16, June 22, 2022, by Mr. GOOD of Virginia on House Resolution 1167, was signed by the following Members: Mr. Good of Virginia, Mr. Burchett, Mr. Gibbs, Mr. Davidson, Mr. Fulcher, Mrs. Greene of Georgia, Mrs. Hartzler, Mr. Higgins of Louisiana, Mr. Biggs, Ms. Foxx, Mr. Posey, Mr. Hudson, Mr. Babin, Mr. Johnson of Louisiana, Mr. Moon-ey, Mr. Clyde, Mr. Moore of Alabama, Mr. Cawthorn, Mr. Feenstra, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Palmer, Mrs. Miller of Illinois, Mr. Rose, Mr. Perry, Mr. Rosendale, Mr. Loudermilk, Mr. Mann, Mr. Smith of Nebraska, Mr. Keller, Mr. Duncan, Mrs. Harshbarger, Mr. Cline, Mr. Cloud, Mr. Rutherford, Mr. Donalds, Mr. Norman, Mr. Harris, Ms. Herrera Beutler, Mr. Gosar, Mr. Burgess, Mr. Massie, Mr. Smith of Missouri, Mr. Weber of Texas, Mr. Wilson of South Carolina, Mr. Buck, Mrs.

Lesko, Mr. Moolenaar, Mr. Roy, Mr. Adersholt, Mr. Grothman, Mr. Green of Tennessee, Mr. Budd, Mr. LaTurner, Mr. Tony Gonzales of Texas, and Mr. Banks.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—
ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 1 by Mrs. CAMMACK on House Resolution 274: Mrs. Flores.

Petition 2 by Mr. ROY on House Resolution 216: Mrs. Flores.

Petition 12 by Mr. GOSAR on House Joint Resolution 46: Mr. Feenstra, Mrs. Hartzler, Ms. Malliotakis, Mr. Wenstrup, Mr. Balderson, Mr. Harris, Mrs. Fischbach, Mr. Johnson of South Dakota, and Mr. LaTurner.